

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR APRIL, 1825.

- Art. I. 1. *Notes on Mexico*, made in the Autumn of 1822. Accompanied by an Historical Sketch of the Revolution, and Translations of Official Reports on the present State of that Country. By a Citizen of the United States. 8vo. pp. 360. Philadelphia. 1824.
2. *The History of Mexico from the Spanish Conquest to the present Era*; containing a condensed View of the Manners, Customs, Religion, Commerce, Soil, and Agriculture; Animal, Vegetable, and Mineral Productions, &c. &c. By Nicholas Mill, Esq. 8vo. pp. 300. Price 10s. 6d. London. 1824.
3. *A Statistical and Commercial History of the Kingdom of Guatemala in Spanish America*: with an Account of its Conquest by the Spaniards, and a Narrative of the principal Events down to the present Time: from Original Records in the Archives; actual Observation; and other authentic Sources. By Don Domingo Juarros, a Native of Guatemala. Translated by J. Bailly, Lieut. R. M. 8vo. pp. 520. Price 16s. London. 1823.
4. *The Modern Traveller*. Parts XI. and XII. Mexico. 18mo. Price 2s. 6d. each. London. 1825.
5. *The Actual State of the Mexican Mines, and the Reasonable Expectations of the Share-holders of the Anglo-Mexican Association*; being the Substance of a Letter addressed to the Directors of that Company; with a Supplement, containing additional Data, confirmed by recent Intelligence from Mexico; and an Appendix of original Mexican Documents. By Sir William Adams. 8vo. pp. 88. London. 1825.

THE recognition of the Mexican and Colombian Republics by the British Government, is one of the most important measures, in whatever light we view it, that have taken place since the year 1782, when Great Britain consented to acknowledge the independence of the United States. That acknowledgement, wrung as it was from this nation's rulers by defeat

and disaster, redounded little to its honour. But the act of justice and sound policy by which the independence of the Southern States is at once recognised and ratified, has all the merit of being uncompelled, as well as timely; and it is made in the teeth of the Holy Alliance and Lord Eldon. It is not a concession which costs nothing, or, at least, which risks nothing; nor is it like the alliance which the Bourbons entered into, in 1778, with the American colonies of England, in the very commencement of their struggle for independence, and which met with its reward in 1789. Mexico has now for four years ceased to be a colony of Spain. Iturbidé commenced the second revolution in Feb. 1821, from which time to his downfall, he was virtually at the head of the government. In August of the same year, O'Donoju, the last viceroy sent out by the mother country, recognised, by the treaty of Cordova, the independence of the Mexican empire. In the May of the following year, 'Augustin the First' (and last) was proclaimed Emperor. His abdication and embarkation took place in the Spring of 1823. On the 27th of March, the Republican army entered the capital, when the old Congress was immediately convoked, and an executive triumvirate appointed, consisting of General Victoria, the present President of the Federal Republic, and Generals Bravo and Negrete. The new Federal Constitution was proclaimed and sworn to in the capital on the 2nd of February, 1824, amid the rejoicings of the people. In July, Iturbidé made the rash and ill-digested attempt to recover an usurped throne at the expense of the peace of the country, which proved fatal to himself only. Over this event there still hangs a considerable degree of mystery. In the letter which he addressed to the Congress on the 19th of March, 1823, containing his abdication, he says: 'That he accepted the crown with the greatest reluctance, and only to serve his country; that from the moment he perceived that his retaining possession of it might serve, if not as a cause, at least as a pretext for civil war, he determined to give it up; that he did not abdicate before, because there was no national representation, generally recognised as such, to receive it; that, as his presence in the country might serve as a pretext for dissensions, he will retire to some foreign land*; and he asks for only a fortnight to prepare for his departure, soliciting the Congress to pay his debts.' All this sounds well, and has a patriotic semblance. Accordingly, his Ex-Majesty was

* He at first proposed to retire to *Jamaica*, but this proposal was of course negatived.

permitted to leave the kingdom, and retire into honourable exile, with a yearly pension of 25,000 dollars settled on him, on the sole condition of not again setting his foot on the territory of the Federal Republic.

Iturbidé embarked, on the 11th of May, 1823, on board an English ship, chartered to Leghorn, his family and suite consisting of twenty-five persons. From Italy, he came to England, whence, on the 11th of May, 1824, he embarked at Southampton for Mexico, taking with him his wife, his two sons, and servants. This step excited at the time a great deal of vague speculation; but, in the total absence of any specific information with regard to the real state of the country, conjecture itself was at fault. It was taken for granted, that no man in the possession of his senses would have taken such a step, unless, like the Emperor of Elba, he could rely upon being received with open arms by the population, or unless he had secured the support of a foreign armament. His own statement was, that he was urgently solicited to return by his countrymen, who considered his presence there as necessary to the establishment of unanimity and the consolidation of the government. Captain Basil Hall, in his interesting "Journal," remarked on this statement: 'The result will shew how far ' Iturbidé's decision is a wise one. That it is a patriotic and ' disinterested decision, I have not the smallest doubt; and ' there does not appear to be the least reason for apprehending ' that his views have any other direction than the service of ' Mexico, and the resistance of the Spaniards, or any other ' nation which may seek to reconquer that country.' The author of an elaborate article on Mexico in the Quarterly Review*, ostensibly compiled from Spanish documents, discovers the same favourable opinion of Iturbidé. 'We have not,' it is said, 'sufficient evidence to assist us in forming an accurate ' judgement of the character and conduct of the ex-emperor, ' but we are rather disposed to think favourably of both, from ' other sources than the official documents before us.' After adverting to the circumstance, that the produce of the mines had increased during his short reign, as *prima facie* evidence in his favour,—although, at the most, it would seem to indicate a return to internal tranquillity, and may, perhaps, be satisfactorily accounted for by an act of Congress which Iturbidé does not appear to have had the merit of originating†,—the Re-

* No. LIX. p. 183.

† 'The Mexican Cortes or Sovereign Constituent Congress met on the 24th of February, 1822; and one of their first, if not their

viewer adds : ' We have read, with attention, the whole of the ' debates in Congress for the two months which followed the ' abdication. We find in them no one direct charge made ' against him, nor any intimation to his disgrace, *except* an as- ' sertion of one of the most vehement of the body, that he ' wished to direct the legislative, as well as the executive ' branch of the government. That member was answered by ' another, who said, " The nation is indebted to him for its ' independence; and if some force was used to procure for ' him the Imperial dignity, the nation had recognised that ' dignity by his coronation, and by the decree for hereditary ' succession; and that the Congress, having been dissolved ' by him, could not judge impartially in their own cause." ' This logic does not, however, appear to have been deemed so satisfactory an answer at Mexico, as it appears to the Re- viewer; for the Congress passed a decree on the 14th of March, 1823, bearing, that the coronation of Don Augustin Iturbidé was an act of violence and not of right. Indeed, the ' answer' admits the fact, that Iturbidé's elevation to the throne was a usurpation,—that force was used. There can be no doubt now, that it was the act of a party, at the head of which is understood to have been the Bishop of Puebla, with the concurrence of the army, which the Congress wished to reduce, and the Regent as naturally desired to augment. Still, it might be said with truth, that the nation had acquiesced in his enthronement. But the charge to which the answer affords no reply, was, that he had wished to engross the legislative, as well as the executive functions, and to make himself an absolute monarch, instead of constitutional emperor. To this he owed his downfall.

In a proclamation said to have been issued by Iturbidé on his landing, (or, more probably, found among his papers,) he professes to have returned to Mexico, not as emperor, but as a soldier and a Mexican, with the sole object of reconciling differences, and of defeating the intrigues which threatened to restore the country to Spanish domination; and he pretends that he had with difficulty eluded the toils which the Holy Alliance were preparing, to prevent him from achieving this patriotic purpose. But if Iturbidé was indeed the consummate

very first act, was an edict permitting all who chose it to leave the country, and *allowing the export of specie at a duty of only 3½ per cent.* This good faith, for it had been long before promised by Iturbidé, gave great confidence to the mercantile capitalists.'

Hall's Journal, Vol. II. p. 256.

politician and disinterested patriot that Captain Hall and the Reviewer seem to imagine, it is strange that he should not have perceived that his presence could only exasperate differences,—and that he could return only as emperor—*aut Caesar aut nihil*. His appearance too, it must be confessed, was most unhappily timed. The federal constitution had been adopted with little opposition throughout the country. Echavarri, who had shewn a disposition to dispute the orders of the Executive in Puebla, deserted by his own troops, had been seized and conveyed a prisoner to the capital; and two other attempts at insurrection had been in like manner quelled by the prudence and vigilance of the government, without bloodshed. There remained no longer a hostile partisan who durst shew himself, and public tranquillity seemed to be established, when Iturbidé arrived to deliver the country from the Holy Alliance! Unfortunately for him, the Mexican Government had received advice of his project; and the letters which announced it, attributed it to an intrigue of the French Government. However this may have been, the ex-emperor knew the penalty attaching to his return; but he seems to have calculated on eluding the vigilance of the Mexican authorities. With this view, he made choice of a point of the coast for his landing, where he might suppose he would least be looked for, in the intendency of San Luis Potosi. On the 14th of July, an English vessel appeared off the port of Soto la Marina, professing to have on board the foreigner Charles de Beneski, and a companion of his, come to Mexico for the purpose of treating with the Government on a plan of colonisation, having to that effect power from three Irish capitalists, merchants in London. On the following day, the commanding officer, General de la Garza, was waited upon by Beneski, who, in answer to the interrogatories put to him respecting Iturbidé, assured him, that, at the time of his sailing, Iturbidé was living privately with his family. He then obtained permission to bring on shore his companion. On the next day but one, information was given, that Beneski was walking on shore with another person, who was disguised; on which De la Garza immediately despatched a party of troops to apprehend them. They were taken at Paraje de los Arroyos, about six leagues from Soto la Marina, when the disguised companion proved to be no other than the ex-emperor. He was immediately sent to Padilla, to be placed at the disposal of the State Congress, by whom it was determined to give immediate effect to the sovereign decree of the 28th of April, denouncing Iturbidé as a traitor in case of his landing; and he was accordingly shot on the evening of the 19th. Those who justify the execution of Murat, the ex-king of Naples,

cannot, with any consistency, blame the Mexican Government for inflicting the same punishment on the ex-emperor. Whatever were his motives, there can be no question that his designs were treasonable ; and the safety of the State required that the last hopes of his party should be extinguished by his death. In the capital, the news was received with no unseemly exultation. Addresses were sent up from the provinces, congratulating the Government on the fate of Iturbidé. But the Sovereign Congress, actuated by feelings which do them the greatest honour, passed a resolution to grant his widow an annual pension of 8000 dollars.

Iturbidé is no more, and we are not disposed to pass a harsh sentence upon his conduct and motives. Perhaps his character may be summed up in one word : he was, to use his own expressions, ' a soldier and a Mexican.' If, however, the intelligent Author of Notes on Mexico has any claims to be regarded as a credible and impartial witness, he was a man of much more address than principle. This gentleman, who is understood to be Mr. Poinsett, Member of the American Congress for South Carolina, was at Mexico during the imperial year, and was introduced to his Majesty as a citizen of the United States. He thus describes the interview, and the impression it produced.

' The Emperor was in his cabinet, and received us with great politeness. Two of his favourites were with him. We were all seated, and he conversed with us for half an hour in an easy, unembarrassed manner, taking occasion to compliment the United States and our institutions, and to lament that they were not suited to the circumstances of his country. He modestly insinuated that he had yielded very reluctantly to the wishes of the people, but had been compelled to suffer them to place the crown upon his head to prevent misrule and anarchy. He is about five feet ten or eleven inches high, stoutly made, and very well proportioned. His face is oval, and his features are very good, except his eyes, which were constantly bent on the ground, or averted. His hair is brown, with red whiskers, and his complexion fair and ruddy, more like that of a German, than of a Spaniard. As you will hear his name pronounced differently, let me tell you that you must accent equally every syllable, I-tur-bi-de. I will not repeat the tales I hear daily of the character and the conduct of this man. Prior to the late successful revolution, he commanded a small force in the service of the Royalists, and he is accused of having been the most cruel and blood-thirsty persecutor of the Patriots, and never to have spared a prisoner. His official letters to the Viceroy substantiate this fact. In the interval between the defeat of the Patriot cause and the last revolution, he resided in the capital ; and, in a society not remarkable for strict morals, he was distinguished for his immorality. His usurpation of the chief authority

has been the most glaring and unjustifiable; and his exercise of power, arbitrary and tyrannical. With a pleasing address and prepossessing exterior, and by lavish profusion, he has attached the officers and soldiers to his person; and so long as he possesses the means of paying and rewarding them, so long he will maintain himself on the throne: when these fail, he will be precipitated from it. It is a maxim of history, which will probably be again illustrated by this example, that a government not founded on public opinion, but established and supported by corruption and violence, cannot exist without ample means to pay the soldiery, and to maintain pensioners and partisans. To judge Iturbide from his public papers, I do not think him a man of talents. He is prompt, bold, and decisive, and not scrupulous about the means he employs to obtain his ends.'

Notes, &c. pp. 292, 3.

Much credit has been given to Iturbidé for the judicious and politic provisions of the Plan of Iguala, the authorship of which Captain Hall is disposed to attribute to Don Augustin himself. We suspect that he had an Abbé Sieyes in the Bishop of Puebla. That prelate is supposed to have been a principal agent in bringing about the Revolution, and in exalting Iturbide to the throne; while the archbishop of Mexico, whom, says the writer above cited, 'all parties unite in praising for his knowledge and virtue, would not be concerned in his elevation, refused to crown him, and retired from the court to his country-seat.' This act sufficiently indicated in what light he regarded his usurpation of the throne. It is certain, that Iturbidé had, from the first, powerful support and discreet advisers; but, in the instances in which he clearly acted from himself, he discovered no marks of a strong or sagacious mind. His harsh and haughty treatment of Santana, the governor of Vera Cruz, which hastened his own downfall, was the height of impolicy; and his conduct, from that moment up to the time of his abdication, was feeble and temporizing; while his last adventure resembled the desperate throw of a losing gamester. It is not a little singular, that he should have fixed upon that point of the coast for his landing, where the unfortunate Xavier Mina landed a few years before,—to meet eventually a similar fate.

All that is known, on the other hand, of the character of the present President of the Mexican States, is highly to his honour as a consistent republican and steady patriot. Guadalupe Victoria is a native of Durango, one of the northern provinces of Mexico. On the breaking out of the first revolution in 1810, he had just finished his studies. With all the enthusiasm of youth, he engaged in the patriot cause, which had an efficient leader, at that period, in the celebrated Morelos. At

the head of his guerillas, Victoria occupied the whole country between Xalapa and Vera Cruz; and long after the death of Morelos, he maintained a desultory warfare, although he appears to have declined co-operating with either Teran or Mina. 'Don Guadalupe Victoria,' says Mr. Robinson in his *Memoirs of the first Mexican Revolution*,

'had at no time under his command more than 2000 men; but he was so well acquainted with the fastnesses of the province of Vera Cruz, that the Royalists could never bring him to a general action. In vain they sent superior forces to attack him; in vain they drove him from one position to another; for, as fast as they destroyed part of his forces in one place, he recruited them in another. More than twenty times the Mexican Gazette has published, that Victoria was slain, and his party annihilated; but, a few days after those false and pompous accounts, we have heard of Victoria suddenly springing up, attacking and capturing convoys of merchandize, seizing some strong holds, and throwing the whole country into consternation. At the head of 150 or 200 cavalry, he performed some of the most daring exploits that were effected during the Revolution; and his personal courage and activity were universally acknowledged even by his enemies. More than four fifths of the population of Vera Cruz were in his favour. Wherever he went, provisions were secretly or openly furnished him. Had he possessed musquets, there were from ten to fifteen thousand men ready to accept them and join his standard. To the want of arms and the munitions of war, and to no other cause, must be attributed his eventual failure. He obtained a few hundred muskets from New Orleans, during the time that he possessed the ports of Boquilla de Piedra and Nautla on the coast of Vera Cruz; but, after those places were retaken by the royalists at the close of 1816, or the beginning of 1817, he was cut off from all foreign supplies. The royalists have since proclaimed that he was slain and his forces destroyed.' *Memoirs*, vol i. pp. 232, 3.

At this period, it has since appeared, that he was indebted for his personal safety to the impervious woods between Xalapa and Vera Cruz, in which for thirty months he lay concealed without seeing the face of a human being. He was proscribed, and an immense sum being set on his head by the Spanish vicere, he could not, it seems, trust the knowledge of his retreat to any of his followers. His privations and sufferings during this long interval were extreme; his only means of subsistence being the vegetable productions or the animal and insect inhabitants of the forests. 'At one time,' Mr. Bullock informs us,

'in consequence of his mental and corporal sufferings, he was attacked by fever, and remained eleven days at the entrance of a cavern, stretched on the ground, without food, hourly expecting a termination of his wretched existence, and the vultures were constantly ho-

vering over him in expectation of their prey. The first nourishment he received, was the warm blood of one of these birds, which had approached to feast on his half-closed eyes, when he seized him by the neck, and was by this means enabled to crawl to the nearest water to slake his parching thirst.* After the expulsion of the Spaniards, an old and faithful Indian discovered his retreat, but with difficulty could recognise his person, he being destitute of clothes, and so altered in appearance that he had scarcely the semblance of a human form.'

Bullock's *Six Months in Mexico*, p. 454.

The individual who could survive such sufferings, must be possessed not merely of a vigorous constitution, but of an unconquerable mental energy, and a rare degree of that true fortitude which is one of the elements of the heroic character. No sooner had Iturbidé raised the standard of independence, than Victoria again appeared in arms; he joined him at San Juan del Rio in the road from Mexico to the interior. The army of the Three Guarantees†, as it was called, marched upon Queretaro, which may be considered as the key to the interior provinces, and gained immediate possession of the place. Here, the army was formed into two divisions. It was assigned to Victoria to head that which marched towards the capital, while the commander in chief made a rapid movement to secure Puebla, which lies between Mexico and the coast. The opportune arrival of the new viceroy, General O'Donoju, and the facility with which that worthy Don was brought to recognise the Plan of Iguala, which amounted to a declaration of the national independence,—superseded the ne-

* Southey would have been glad of this thrilling anecdote, to add another circumstance of horror to his fine description of 'Roderick in solitude.'

‘ — the sepulchre would be
No hiding-place for him; no Christian hands
Were here, who should compose his decent corpse
And cover it with earth. There he might drag
His wretched body at its passing hour,
And there the sea-birds of her heritage
Would rob the worm, or peradventure seize,
Ere death had done its work, their helpless prey.
Ev'n now they did not fear him
As if, being thus alone, humanity
Had lost its rank, and the prerogative
Of man was done away.’

† These Guarantees were, the Roman Catholic religion in its purity, the national independence, and the union of Americans and Spaniards.

cessity of any further military proceedings. The Spanish garrison marched out of Mexico with the honours of war, and on the the 27th of September, 1821, the two generals, Iturbidé and O'Donoju, entered the capital together amid the acclamations of the inhabitants.

Conformably to the previous arrangements, a junta of thirty-six persons was now appointed, by whom was chosen a regency consisting of five, Iturbidé president, who was at the same time appointed admiral and generalissimo, with a yearly salary of 120,000 dollars. The attention of all classes was now directed to the convocation of a Cortes. Iturbidé, in the name of the regency, submitted to the junta a plan by which two chambers were to be constituted ; the first to consist of twelve or fifteen priests, as many military officers, one delegate from every municipal council throughout the empire, and one from each territorial court of judicature. The second chamber, from which all these classes were to be excluded, was to consist of deputies to be elected by the people, in the proportion of 1 for every 50,000 of the population. This plan was rejected by the junta, and it seems to have been the first thing that awaked a distrust of the president. The first chamber would have resembled Bonaparte's senate, or Cromwell's council of state ; it would have been a packed committee of Iturbidé's partizans ; while the exclusion of the priesthood and the military from the chamber of deputies, would have shut out the individuals from whom alone Iturbidé had to apprehend much opposition in carrying into execution his ambitious schemes. In the plan that was eventually adopted, the same proportion of representation was preserved, but it was directed, that each province should return one ecclesiastic, one lawyer, and one military man, so that all classes might be fairly represented. The people, however, were not satisfied with the plan, and a conspiracy is said to have been formed, to compel the junta to adopt the provisions of the Spanish constitution. It was headed by Generals Victoria and Bravo, but, being revealed to Iturbidé by one of the party, those generals, with several other officers, were arrested and imprisoned. Mr. Bullock gives a somewhat different version of the matter. ' The moment he (Victoria) considered the views of Iturbidé as injurious to the rights of the people, he *publicly* denounced him, on which he was arrested and confined.' This open and fearless mode of proceeding certainly appears more in unison with Victoria's character ; but, whether chargeable with conspiracy or insubordination, the event proved that his suspicions of Iturbidé's intentions were well founded, and there was no one whom the latter had more reason to fear. They were not made to move

in the same orbit. *Victoria's* friends enabled him to make his escape from imprisonment, and he proceeded a second time to his old place of concealment in the woods below *Xalapa*. We now again lose sight of him till the beginning of the year 1823, when a new turn of affairs again brought him forward in defence of the cause to which he had steadily devoted himself. A Spanish garrison still retained possession of the fortress of *San Juan Ullua*, which commands the port and city of *Vera Cruz*, and they had recently committed some acts of hostility. After some correspondence with the governor, *Iturbidé*, thinking that, in a personal interview, he might better succeed in bringing him to terms, left the capital on the 10th of Nov. 1822, and had proceeded as far as *Xalapa*, when an event occurred which led to results he little anticipated. The Author of "*Notes on Mexico*" gives the following account of the circumstances.

'Santana, the governor of *Vera Cruz*, an active, enterprising officer, who commanded the forces that stormed that city when it was taken from the royalists, and who had long enjoyed an independent command, could not brook the control of a superior. Disputes soon arose between him and *Echavarri*, the commander-in-chief of the southern division; and Santana was summoned before the emperor at *Xalapa*, to answer the charges preferred against him by *Echavarri*. Sure of the protection of his imperial master, to whom he had always shewn the most devoted attachment, he readily obeyed the summons; but, to his great surprise, *Iturbidé* treated him harshly, and dismissed him from the command of *Vera Cruz*. Enraged by this unexpected treatment, Santana suddenly left *Xalapa*, and riding day and night, arrived at *Vera Cruz* before the news of his disgrace had reached there. He instantly assembled his own regiment, and pointing out to them the odious character of the government imposed upon them by *Iturbidé*, he exhorted them to take up arms in defence of the liberties of their country. This exhortation was in unison with the wishes of all the officers, both of the garrison of *Vera Cruz* and of the neighbouring towns. The character of Santana, and his supposed attachment to the emperor, had alone prevented them from openly declaring in favour of a liberal system of government.

'The standard of the republic was unfurled at *Vera Cruz*; and Santana addressed a letter to *Iturbidé*, in which he reminds him of the obligations he owed to him, of the part he had taken in his elevation to the throne, and of the affection he had always manifested for him,—but declaring, that his duty to his country now required him to set aside every other consideration, and to oppose the man who had reduced the nation to the utmost misery. He reproaches him with having broken his oath, and dissolved the congress by violence; and tells him, that the people are convinced, that under his government, the sacred rights of property will never be respected. He then states his intention to re-assemble the congress, and to esta-

blish a republican government; sets forth the means he possesses of carrying his plan into effect; and advises Iturbidé to renounce the crown, and to rely upon the generosity of the congress, which will take care to reward his services.

‘ The emperor did not relish this advice, and ordered Echavarri, who was at Xalapa, to advance with the division under his command against the insurgents, as he called the troops of Santana. The latter advanced to Puente del Rey, which he fortified; and several smart actions were fought between the imperialists and the republicans. In this state of things, Guadalupe Victoria left his hiding-place in the mountains, and joined Santana. At first, he was appointed second in command; but Santana soon found the interests of the party required, that an officer who had been an undeviating republican, and who enjoyed the entire confidence of the troops and of the people, should be raised to the supreme command. Guadalupe Victoria was accordingly declared commander in-chief: the people flocked to his standard, and the insurrection spread throughout the whole province.

‘ On the 1st of February, 1823, an arrangement was made by Echavarri and the officers commanding the imperialists, with Guadalupe Victoria and Santana; and the two armies, united, sent commissions to Iturbidé, offering terms, but insisting upon a congress being immediately assembled to frame a liberal and republican constitution. Iturbidé, in his turn, sent commissions to Echavarri and his officers, to endeavour to divert them from their purpose; and immediately marched with a small body of troops, and took post at Istapaluca, a town four leagues from the capital, on the road to Puebla. The defection of the army of Echavarri, was the signal of revolt in all the other provinces. Oaxaca, Guadalaxara, Guanaxuato, San Luis Potosi, declared in favour of a republican government; and in the capitals of those provinces, in Queretaro, and in Valladolid, the inhabitants rose and imprisoned the imperial commanders. The generals Guerrero and Bravo, men who had been distinguished in the wars of the revolution, secretly departed from Mexico, and appeared in arms in the west.

‘ The province and city of Puebla were soon after added to the number of Iturbidé’s enemies. The Marquess de Vivanco assumed the government of that place, and soon organised a strong force. The army of Xalapa now pushed forward to Puebla, where they were joined by Negrete and several officers of distinction, and the advanced guard of the republicans was stationed at San Martin de Tesmelucos.

‘ The emperor returned to the capital, and, on the 8th of March, he called together all the members of the old congress who were in the city, and tendered his abdication.’

The result, we have anticipated. The republican army entered the capital; the old Congress was immediately convoked; and an executive triumvirate was appointed, consisting of Generals Victoria, Bravo, and Negrete. A new constituent Congress was subsequently elected, to

which, on the 20th of November, 1823, the prospectus of a constitution was submitted, which was adopted with some slight modifications. By this instrument, the Mexican nation adopts for its government, the form of 'a representative, popular, federal republic,' and the empire is distributed into sixteen independent states, the executive being lodged in a president and vice-president of the Mexican Federation, after the model of the United States of the North. General Victoria was chosen President, and General Bravo, Vice-president. No man seems to enjoy or to deserve a larger share of the confidence of his countrymen than the former, and his being invested with the supreme power cannot but be regarded as an auspicious omen, as regards the stability of the existing arrangements. 'A real well-wisher,' says Mr. Bullock, 'to the cause of rational liberty, coolness and determination in the hour of danger, and an ardent determination to form a connexion with *this* country, have ever been the leading features of his character.' To this testimony may be added that of the American Writer: 'Victoria, while he had distinguished himself, from the commencement of the revolution, by his devotion to the cause of freedom, and by his valour, activity, and disinterested generosity, had won the hearts of the people by the strictest observance of the forms of the Roman Catholic religion.' If these testimonies give us a faithful representation of his character, Mexico may indeed be congratulated on having exchanged a second-rate Napoleon for a Washington.

We have been induced to give this brief sketch of the state of affairs in Mexico, to enable our readers to judge how far the character of stability may reasonably be supposed to attach to the existing government, and to our rapidly increasing commercial relations with that country. In a recent Number of the Quarterly Review, (a journal which has the reputation of a sort of semi-official, underling authority,) some oracular expressions of a most sinister import are thrown out, which seem designed to create distrust on this subject. The immediate business of the Writer is, to vituperate Lord Cochrane and all the revolutionary leaders of the South American republics. Towards the close of the article, he says: 'We have been speaking of South America, for we *still* entertain hopes, though by no means sanguine hopes, that a better fate may be reserved for Mexico and Guatimala.' It is impossible to mistake the tone and spirit of this ill-timed inuendo. The fall of Iturbidé is the only circumstance that could possibly supply a pretence for any diminution of confidence in the stability of the Mexican government; and this event, though it may be

deplored by the Reviewer as having led to the substitution of another American Federal Republic for an hereditary monarchy, has in fact removed the greatest obstacle to national unanimity, by extinguishing a restless and intriguing party. 'That country,' (Mexico,) adds the Reviewer, 'declared itself independent of Spain too, at a period when the fallacy of the wild theories of democracy had been extensively exposed in all their hollowness and egotism. Guatemala has suffered less from internal convulsion than Mexico; and, though it withdrew from the connexion with that country on the abdication of Iturbidé, it may be again united with it.' With regard to the former part of this statement, meant, apparently, to pay a compliment to the Authors of the Plan of Iguala, at the expense of all other constitution-makers, it is quite incorrect: the government of Mexico is essentially democratic, and, from the moment that it threw off the yoke of Spain, it became, if not in theory, nor at first in outward form, yet, at once in fact, and from necessity, a republic. The aristocracy of Mexico were the Europeans: the rest were the people. Iturbidé's plan went to level these Spanish nobles to an equality with the Creoles, to blend them down into one democracy. This union has been found impossible: the Spaniards were all Bourbonists at heart; they could never have become Mexicans. The election of Victoria and Bravo has for ever extinguished the hopes of the French and Spanish faction, as it is known to present an insurmountable obstacle to the restoration of European supremacy. With regard to Guatemala, it is stated by Mr. Poinsett to have declared its independence at the same time as Mexico, but to have refused to unite with that government. Since the fall of Iturbidé, these provinces, with the exception of Chiapa, (which has united itself to the Mexican Federation,) have formed themselves into a Federal Republic under the style and title of 'The Confederate States of the Centre of America.' They have adopted a similar form of government; the legislative consisting of a senate and a house of representatives, and the executive being vested in a president and vice-president, elected every four years. This government has been recognized by that of Mexico, and its envoys have been received by the United States. The population is computed at a million and a half: Mexico contains seven millions. We have no reason to believe that its separation from Mexico had any thing to do with the abdication of Iturbidé, as the Reviewer intimates. It has always had its distinct government, and its annexation to the Mexican Federacy would only have endangered the harmony of the union, by affording the wider scope for the operation of that provincial

spirit which is one of the greatest dangers that a Federal government has to contend with.

It is time that we notice more specifically the works mentioned at the head of this article. Of the "Notes on Mexico," only a few copies have reached this country, but we understand that an English edition is in the press. Although the statistical information which it contains, is chiefly drawn from Humboldt's invaluable Political Essay on New Spain, the volume will be found highly acceptable, as it comprises a description of some parts of the country which have hitherto been scarcely known to English readers even by name. The route from Vera Cruz to Mexico has been fully described by Mr. Bullock; but Mr. Poinsett proceeded as far North as Guanaxuato, the centre of the richest mining district, and thence, by way of San Luis Potosi, to Tampico, where he embarked for the Havannah. The most valuable portion of the volume, however, is the historical sketch and the appendix of state papers, including the Report of the Secretary of State, Don Lucas Alaman, to the Sovereign Congress, which is a complete *exposé* of the state of the nation up to that period. Of these materials, the Editor of the Modern Traveller has copiously availed himself in his first part of Mexico, which is chiefly occupied with a history of the country from the Spanish conquest to the present times, compiled from Robertson, De Solis, Humboldt, Robinson's Memoirs, Captain Basil Hall's Journal, the Notes on Mexico, and other authorities; the second comprises a description of Vera Cruz, Puebla, and the capital, drawn from Humboldt, Bullock's "Six Month's Residence," and other recent travellers; and the succeeding two parts are to complete the description of Mexico and Guatemala. The following view of the state of society in Mexico, while it will illustrate some of the preceding observations, will serve as a specimen of the style and execution of this deservedly popular little work.

'The Revolution has at least effected some of the changes recommended by the Bishop to the Government. The copper-coloured race are declared, together with all the castes, to be possessed of the same rights as the whites. The "odious personal impost" of the *tributo* is also abolished; but, as a matter of course, they will now be subject to the alcabala and other taxes from which they were exempt. "Measures," however, "must be taken," says the American Citizen, "to educate the Indians, and lands must be distributed among them, before they can be considered as forming a part of the people of a free government." This very measure the Bishop of Mechoacan urges: "Let a portion of the domains of the crown (*tierras realenguas*), which are generally uncultivated, be granted to the Indians

and the castes; let an agrarian law be passed for Mexico, similar to that of the Asturias and Galicia, by which the poor cultivator is permitted to appropriate, under certain conditions, the land which the great proprietors have left uncultivated, to the detriment of the national industry." The other changes which the Bishop recommends, are, that liberty should be given alike to the Indians, the castes, and the whites, to settle in each other's villages, and that all judges and district magistrates should have fixed salaries. We know not how far the Federal Government has hitherto realised these wise suggestions; but there is room to hope that they will at least be eventually accomplished.

' Previously to the Revolution, the Europeans (a word then held synonymous with Spaniard) are supposed to have constituted only the 70th part of the population, their proportion to the white Creoles being as one to fourteen. In the capital, according to an official census drawn up by the Count de Revillagigedo, in every hundred inhabitants, forty-nine were Spanish Creoles, two European Spaniards, twenty-four Aztec and Otomite Indians, and twenty-five of mixed blood. Of 1,200,000 whites, who were then reckoned to be included in the population of New Spain, Humboldt supposes that not more than 70 or 80,000 were Europeans. We have already referred to the pernicious policy which led to the bestowment of all employments on the natives of Old Spain. "The most miserable European," says Humboldt, "without education and without intellectual cultivation, thinks himself superior to the whites born in the new continent." Captain Hall states that the Spaniards were absurdly unguarded in the terms they used in speaking of the natives. They delighted to contrast their own *superior ilustracion* with the *ignorancia barbara* of the Mexicans; and if any one ventured to insinuate, that this ignorance of the natives might, perhaps, have been produced by the manner in which the country had been governed,—they would turn fiercely on us, and maintain that they were incapable of being educated.

' The castes are estimated by Humboldt as forming a total of nearly 2,400,000,—a proportion of the population almost as considerable as the Indians. The mestizoes, or *metis*, are by far the most numerous, being reckoned to form seven-eighths of the half-cast natives. Their colour is almost a pure white, with a skin of remarkable transparency. The small beard, and small hands and feet, and a certain obliquity of the eyes, are more certain indications of the mixture of Indian blood, than the nature of the hair. If a *mestiza* marries a white man, the second generation differs hardly in any thing from the European race.

' The greater or smaller degree of whiteness of skin, decides the rank of the individual in society. "A white who rides barefoot, thinks he belongs to the nobility of the country." When any one of the lower orders enters into a dispute with one of the titled lords of the country, it is no unusual thing to hear him say, 'Do you think me not so white as yourself?' It not unfrequently occurs, that families suspected of mixed blood apply to the high court of justice for a certificate that they are white; and in this way, some very swarthy

mulattoes have had the address to get themselves whitened. When the colour affords too palpable a contradiction of the declaration sought for, the petitioner is obliged to content himself with the somewhat problematical sentence, that such or such individuals may consider themselves as whites (*que se tengan por blancos*).

‘Of all the European colonies under the torrid zone, Mexico is the country in which there are the fewest negroes. “One may go through the whole city of Mexico,” says Humboldt, “without seeing a single black. In this point of view, Mexico presents a striking contrast to the Havannah, Lima, and the Caraccas. The negroes of Jamaica are, to those of New Spain, in the proportion of 250 to 1. According to the most authentic accounts it appeared, that in 1793, in all New Spain, there were not 6000 negroes, and, at the very utmost, 9 or 10,000 slaves, of whom the greater number belonged to the ports of Vera Cruz and Acapulco, or the *tierras calientes*.” By the laws, there could be no Indian slaves in the Spanish colonies; and though these laws were notoriously evaded, the slaves were taken more under the protection of the government than the negroes in other European colonies, and every facility was given to their obtaining their manumission. To the honour of the federal republic, slavery can no longer exist on the Mexican soil.

‘Among the various ranks or orders into which society is distributed, we have to notice, first, the titled nobility, who are all white Creoles, to whom it will be proper to restrict the term Mexicans. They are thus characterised by the American Traveller: “Satisfied with the enjoyment of their large estates, and with the consideration which their rank and wealth confer, they seek no other distinction; they are not remarkable for their attainments, or for the strictness of their morals. The lawyers, (it is added,) who, in fact, exercise much more influence over the people, rank next to the nobles. They are the younger branches of noble houses, or the sons of Europeans, and are distinguished by shrewdness and intelligence. Next in importance are the merchants and shopkeepers; for the former are not sufficiently numerous to form a separate class: they are wealthy, and might possess influence, but have hitherto taken little part in the politics of the country, most probably from the fear of losing their property. The labouring class in the cities and towns includes all castes and colours: they are industrious and orderly, and view with interest what is passing around them; most of them can read, and in the large cities, papers and pamphlets are hawked about the streets, and sold at a cheap rate. The labouring class in the country is composed, in the same manner, of different castes: they are sober, industrious, docile, ignorant, and superstitious, and may be led by their priests or masters to good or evil. Their apathy has in some measure been overcome by the long struggle for independence, in which most of them bore a part, but they are still under the influence and direction of the priests. The last class, unknown as such in a well regulated society, consists of beggars and idlers, drones that prey upon the community, and who, having nothing to lose, are always ready to swell the cry of popular ferment, or to lend their aid in favour of

imperial tyranny. The influence of this class, where it is numerous, upon the fate of revolutions, has always been destructive to liberty."

"In this enumeration, however, it is strange that no specific notice is taken of the clergy, except as exerting a powerful influence over the labouring classes. "It may not be altogether correct," it is said, "to consider their influence as confined exclusively to the upper and lower orders of society; but certainly, a very large proportion of the middle class are exempt from it. Unfortunately, too many who were educated in the forms of the Roman Catholic church, have emancipated themselves from its superstitions, only to become sceptics and infidels." The inequality of fortune which is found in the class of proprietors, is still more conspicuous among the clergy. "A number of them suffer extreme poverty, while others possess revenues which surpass those of many of the sovereign princes of Germany. The Mexican clergy are composed of only 10,000 individuals, half of whom are regulars who wear the cowl. If we include lay brothers and sisters, and all those who are not in orders, we may estimate them at 13 or 14,000. The annual revenues of the eight Mexican bishops, amount to a sum total of 118,000*l.*; but the income of the bishop of Sonora amounts only to the twentieth part of that of the bishops of Valladolid and Mechoacan; and, what is truly distressing, in the diocese of an archbishop whose revenue amounts to 27,000*l.*, there are clergymen of Indian villages whose income does not exceed from 20*l.* to 25*l.*" ' pp. 208—215.

Mr. Nicholas Mill has evidently performed his task in a very hasty manner. The 'history of Mexico' occupies only the last fifty pages of his volume; the remainder being devoted to a statistical account of the country, taken almost entirely from Humboldt, to whom it might have been as well if the Author had made some reference by way of acknowledgement. The typographical errors in names are numerous, and the historical sketch is full of inaccuracies. Thus, we have Santana and Santa Ana mentioned, as two different generals; Iturbidé is styled chief of the 'tri-gaurantee army;' Xalapa, or Jalapa, is repeatedly written Zalapa and Zalappa; General Guerrero is called Garrero; Victoria is represented as having supported Iturbidé in his usurpation of the throne; O'Donoju is stated to have died 'not without suspicion of poison,' for which, we believe, there is not the slightest ground; the river Santiago is called Gaudalaxara, the name of the intendancy which it traverses, but mis-spelt; and Mexico is stated to be 'abundantly supplied with rivers of very considerable size,'—the fact being notoriously the reverse. Among the original information, we find it stated, that 'there is now (1824) a good 'carriage road from Vera Cruz to Mexico, from Mexico to 'Guanaxuato, and from thence to St. Luis Potosi.' Mr. Bullock, who, in 1823, was four days in reaching Xalapa from

Vera Cruz, which he complains that an English stage-coach on English roads could have performed in seven or eight hours,—will be delighted to find on his return, that a good carriage road has been constructed in this short time all the way to Mexico, the mountains included. And should Mr. Poinsett again journey from Guanaxuato to San Luis, his delight and astonishment will be equal at finding a good carriage road, where he found only a narrow mule track, leading over steep and rugged mountains, and through narrow defiles, which no carriage could traverse. Yet, with all these blunders and marks of haste, Mr. Mill's volume may be found a useful abridgement or compendium, as the errors are not very material, and the information, though not very original, is important.

The "History of Guatemala" is an interesting and valuable document, having all the recommendations and disadvantages of an original work written by a native, and that native a dignitary of the church. Minutely specific, authentic, and entertaining, it is at the same time somewhat tediously particular; and the worthy Don has not the gift of arrangement, any more than that of compression. The Translator has, indeed, found it necessary to make some retrenchments, for which he apologizes in the preface.

' In a country where Catholicism governs with autocratic despotism, and where the general mass of population possesses no more of the lights of science, than the ruling power, for reasons well adapted to preserve an unlimited sway, thinks proper to permit, it follows, almost as a matter of course, that when an author who is a dignitary of the Church, writes a history of that country, how liberal soever in sentiment and little tinged with bigotry he may be, the minutiae of religion will, from many and very cogent causes, form a prominent feature in his work; and the original of the present account abounds in passages of this description. But as introducing this portion of it into the translation would have nearly doubled the size, and consequently increased the price of the book, without contributing to make it more generally interesting, many chapters have been entirely omitted. Yet, that the reader may not remain wholly uninformed of their import, he is presented with the heads of some of them, viz. Of the Metropolitan Church of Guatemala, with a History of the Image of Nuestra Señora del Socorro worshipped in it.—Of the Convents in the city of Guatemala.—Of the Nunneries and Religious Houses for Females.—Of inferior Religious Orders or Fraternities.—Of the Parishes and Chapels of the City, with their Religious Festivals.—Of the Coronation of the Image of St. Joseph.—Of Festivals celebrated in the Cathedral.—A Chronological Account of the Governors and Captains-General of the Kingdom.—Idem of Archbishops and Bishops of the different Dioceses.—Idem of illustrious Ecclesiastics,

and other individuals who have flourished in the Capital ;—and several others of a similar character.*

As the volume is furnished with an alphabetical index, it is singular that it should have been sent forth without a table of contents. It is distributed into fifty-five chapters, which again have sometimes their subdivisions. We subjoin the titles.

* *Treatise the First.—Succinct Notices of the natural and political History of the principal Places.*—Chap. 1. Of the kingdom of Guatemala in general.—2. Of the five provinces on the coast of the Pacific. (Chiapa*, Suchiltepec, Escuintla, Zonzonate, and St. Salvador.)—3. Of the five provinces on the shores of the Atlantic. (Vera Paz, Chiquimula, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.)—4. Of the five middle provinces. (Totonicapan or Gueguetonango, Quezaltenango, Solola, Chimaltenango, and Sacatepec, containing the city of Old Guatemala.)—5. to 8. Topographical description and history of Old Guatemala. *Treatise the Second.—General History of the Kingdom.* Chap. 1. On the establishment of the Monarchy, and the kings who governed it at the arrival of the Spaniards.—2. Account of the Quichés.—3. History of the Tultecas.—4. Laws and Government of the Indians.—5. Manners and Customs.—6. Variety of native Languages.—7. Proofs that Guatemala was never subject to the Mexican Empire.—8. Number of provinces at different periods—distribution into four intendancies.—9. Intendancy of Ciudad Real de Chiapa.—10. Foundation of Ciudad Real.—11. District of Soconusco.—12. Province of Tzendales.—13. First establishment of the Pipil Indians.—14. Conquest of the provinces on the coast of the Pacific.—15. Remarkable objects in Escuintla.—16. Foundation of St. Salvador.—17. Invasion of Martin Estete.—18. Of the cities of San Miguel de la Frontera, San Vincente de Austria, and Trinidad de Zonzonate.—19. Remarkable objects in St. Salvador.—20. Conquest of Vera Paz, Alcala, and La Manché.—21. Remarkable objects in Vera Paz.—22 and 23. Reduction of the Indians.—24 and 25. Conquest of Chiquimula, and remarkable objects in the province.—26. Alcadia of Amatique and Port Dulce.—27. Discovery and settlement of the province of Honduras.—28. Discovery, &c. of Nicaragua.—29. Revolt of Rodrigo de Contreras.—30. Province of Costa Rica.—31, 32, and 33. Conquest of Tologalpa, Taguzgalpa, and Talamanca.—34. History of the five middle provinces.—35 and 36. Conquest of Quiche and Guatemala.—37. Different positions of the capital.—38. Reduction of the Zutugil Indians.—39. Conquest of Sacatepec.—40. Capture of Mixco.—41 and 42. Insurrection of 1526.—43, 44, and 45. History of subsequent conquests.—46. Description of the valley of Guatemala.—Remarkable objects in the middle provinces.*

* The province of Chiapa has joined itself to the Mexican Federation, and is now an integral part of that Republic.

Nothing can be worse than the *mis-arrangement* of these multifarious contents. To be fairly readable, the work requires to be entirely re-written. Instead of the two treatises, which partly go over the same ground, the physical geography and natural history, the political history, and the topographical and statistical details, should have formed the three grand divisions, and the subdivisions should have corresponded to the territorial arrangement. By this means, the volume might have been compressed into two thirds of its present bulk. As a specimen of the worthy Don's style of composition and manner of reasoning, we subjoin his *demonstration* that the kingdom of Guatemala was never subject to the Mexican empire.

' Autzol, the eighth king of Mexico, although in possession of an extensive and flourishing empire, was ambitious of amplifying it by the annexation of Guatemala; for this purpose, he employed all his forces to bring the Tultecan chiefs who then governed it, under his dominion; *but*, failing in his open attacks, he endeavoured to obtain his object by other means. He sent a special embassy to the chiefs, to treat for an alliance between the two kingdoms; but this insidious attempt was attended with as little success as his more undisguised endeavours; for, when his emissaries were introduced to the king of Utatlan, that monarch would not give them an audience on the subject of their mission, sagaciously alleging that he could not understand their language. The ambassadors then proceeded to the court of Guatemala, where they were received with more civility and distinction, but ultimately dismissed without obtaining their object. After this repulse, they next directed their counsel to the capital of the Zutugiles; but the king of that country, who was then living on bad terms with the princes of his own family, received them with unequivocal marks of hostility: finding themselves in danger, they returned without delay to the city of Utatlan, from which the king of Quiché ordered them to depart on the following day, and to quit his dominions within twenty days. These dismissals were accompanied with less than usual courtesy, because the chiefs suspected, and not without good foundation, that the proposal of peace and alliance was nothing more than a stratagem of Autzol's to cover his real design, which was, that his messengers should examine the roads, ascertain the forces of the different nations, and take note of such places as lay open to attack with the greatest probability of success. Enrico Martinez and some other writers were probably misled by the vaunting boasts of the king of Mexico on the return of his ambassadors, to state, as a positive fact, that Guatemala was subject to the Mexicans before the period of the Spanish conquest; they have, however, omitted to adduce any arguments to substantiate this opinion, or to refer to any monuments or authorities to give it probability.

' There exist proofs sufficiently strong to warrant an opposite conclusion. Acosta asserts that it was a practice of the Mexicans, to induce the inhabitants of all the provinces and towns that they made

themselves masters of, to learn voluntarily and make use of the Mexican idiom; or else to compel them by force to do so. From this fact, it may clearly be inferred, that, as the language of Mexico is not generally spoken in this kingdom, it never was subject to the empire of Mexico. It is an admitted fact, that the Pipil Indians, who are settled along the coasts of the Pacific, from the province of Escuintla to that of St. Salvador, speak a corrupt Mexican language; but it is a fact equally incontrovertible, that these Indians are descended from certain Mexicans, whom the Emperor Autzol found the means of introducing into these countries in the character of traders, in order to form a party for himself that would be useful in furthering his attempts at subjugating the kingdom. Besides the Pipiles, there are other tribes who use the Mexican idiom; but, as many Mexican Indians came with the Spanish conquerors, it is more than probable that they established themselves in colonies, and that these are their descendants. Although it be admitted that the Mexican language is spoken in some parts of Guatemala, yet, as it is not used in the places where the capitals of the Tultecan kings were situated, the fact, that these caciques never were subdued by the Mexicans, remains unshaken; for, had the contrary been the case, these very towns would have been the places where, in compliance with the Mexican practice, that language would have been most predominant.

‘Bernal Diaz del Castillo furnishes another corroboration of the fact. He says that, at the time of the conquest of Guatemala, there was no open road from the kingdom of Mexico into the province of Chiapa; there were only narrow paths, in many places very indistinct, and in others, all traces of them were entirely lost, insomuch that the Spaniards found it necessary to make use of the mariner’s compass to direct them in the route which they intended to pursue. The district of Soconusco was equally devoid of practicable roads. The historian Herrera says, that Pedro de Alvarado began to open a road through the provinces of Soconusco and Guatemala. As there was no road from Mexico to Guatemala, it is not easy to conceive how the latter kingdom could be subject to the former, as there were not the means of keeping up a communication even between the principal places of the two countries. How could the orders of the emperor be conveyed to his vassals? Or how could the tributes and contributions of the latter be conveyed to the treasury of the former? How could the numerous armies that must have been requisite to overcome such powerful kings as those of Quiché, Guatemala, and Atitan, march to these conquests, without leaving an ample road by which to trace their progress.’ pp. 200—4.

An apparent anxiety on the part of a native of Guatemala to prove that his country was never subject to Mexico, is a circumstance of some interest, in the present relation of the two Republics, if it may be taken as an indication of a prevalent feeling. Some of Don Domingo’s proofs, however, are by no means so conclusive as he would have them be thought. The want of what a European would call a *road*, leading from

Mexico to Guatemala, by no means proves that there was no intercourse. If such an obstacle was not found sufficient to stop the progress of Cortes or Alvarado, much less would it be made a barrier in the way of king Autzol and his Mexicans. The same difficulty had to be surmounted by the kings of Tenochtitlan in extending their conquests beyond the valley of Mexico. But the worthy Author forgets that, according to his own story, the Tultecas or Toltecs, who 'were descended from the house of Israel,' and came over to Mexico in the time of Moses, to escape the chastisement due to their idolatry,—were led by their king Nimaquiché from Tula in Mexico into Guatemala. Road or no road, they found their way. Moreover, as the powerful and polished people who sprang from this most remarkable emigration, undoubtedly 'maintained an intercourse with the Egyptians' (see p. 209), it would have been very strange that they should have had no means of communicating with their Mexican brethren. But the contrary is most manifest: the kings of Tula and of Quiché acknowledged, we are told, their common origin, and 'maintained a communication with each other.'

'For it is related, in a manuscript of sixteen quarto folios, which is preserved by the Indians of the village of St. Andres Xecul, that when Montezuma was made prisoner, he sent a private ambassador to Kicab Tanub, king of Quiché, to inform him, that some white men had arrived in his States, and made war upon him with such impetuosity, that the whole strength of his people was unable to resist them; that he was himself a prisoner surrounded with guards, &c.'

Now if, argues our Author, 'Montezuma, watched as he was by his keepers, could contrive to despatch this messenger secretly to Kicab, there is no doubt that *frequent* intercourse took place between them in the time of peace and tranquillity.' But if so, there must have been a way by which tributes and contributions might find their way into the Mexican treasury.

Nor is Don Domingo's proof, drawn from the diversity of dialects in Guatemala, less inconclusive. The number of languages spoken in Mexico exceeds twenty, and some of them are said to differ remarkably from the Aztec; especially that of the Tarasc Indians of Mechoacan, which is distinguished by abounding in vowels, the Otomite, and the Zapotec. Yet, the Aztec empire of Montezuma II. has generally been made to extend over districts in which these are the vernacular dialects,—we admit, however, on doubtful premises. Leaving these learned reveries, which serve but to shew how inextricably involved in uncertainty is the problem relating to the first peopling and subsequent civilization of the New Continent,—thus much is clear; that Guatemala, having been made a distinct captain-

generalship under its Spanish conquerors, has a good right to hold herself independent still of her Mexican sister ;—provided that the provinces of this Central Federation are sufficiently connected together by common interests and feelings to admit of an efficient executive power being vested in the President. Otherwise, the example of Chiapa may lead other provinces to put themselves under the protection of the stronger power, and Guatemala may find her independence a troublesome privilege. The province of Soconusco, which has united itself to the Central States, was, prior to 1569, under the jurisdiction of the *audiencia* of Mexico ; and, in the ecclesiastical division of the territory, it belongs to the diocese of Chiapa.

Of the topography of both these countries, little or nothing was known prior to the visit of Humboldt. In Mexico, the capital, and the eastern and western ports, Vera Cruz and Acapulco,—in Guatemala, the bay of Honduras,—were sufficiently familiar to us by name ; but even the provincial divisions, as well as the most remarkable natural curiosities, remained unknown. Robertson speaks of the provinces of Yucatan and Honduras as alike belonging to New Spain, although the latter was never included in the viceroyalty. ‘ Still further east,’ he adds, ‘ lie the two provinces of Costa Rica and Veragua, which likewise belong to the viceroyalty of New Spain ; but both have been so much neglected by the Spaniards, and are apparently of such small value, that they merit no particular attention.’* This is the only notice that he takes of the captain-generalship of Guatemala, and it is evident that he was totally ignorant both of its physical features and its internal divisions ; for he passes over not only the important province of Nicaragua, the first that was conquered by the Spaniards, but that which contains the capital of the country. An Encyclopedia published in London, in 1802, which devotes not quite a column to the article Mexico, states that New Spain is divided into the three audiences of Guadalajara, Mexico, and Guatemala, subdivided into provinces ! But Pinkerton, in the second edition of his Modern Geography, is still more strangely and inexcusably inaccurate, and he has drawn down upon himself, by his blunders and his arrogance, the somewhat pointed rebuke of M. Humboldt. ‘ This author,’ says the latter, ‘ who believes himself to possess a singular knowledge of the true territorial divisions of New Spain, considers the provinces of Sonora, Cinaloa, and la Pimeria as parts of New Biscay. He divides what he calls the dominions of Mexico into the districts of New Galicia, Panuco, Zacatula, &c. &c. Which is as if we should

* Robertson's America. Book VII.

'say, that the three great divisions of Europe are Spain, Languedoc, Catalonia, and the territories of Cadiz and Bourdeaux.' Never did any traveller in civilized or semi-civilized regions, find the ground so unoccupied by predecessors as Humboldt; and never did any writer who undertook to give an account of a country, leave so little to be done by those who should follow him. Humboldt's Political Essay on New Spain was the first, and it still remains the only account we have of that country. 'I refer you back to Humboldt,' says Mr. Poinsett, 'who has seen every thing, and described every thing with wonderful minuteness and accuracy; and I exhort you to have patience with his erudite digressions. Connect all the facts in his "Essai Politique," and you will acquire, if not a perfect knowledge of this country, certainly a much better idea of it than you can of any other country, from any other book of travels. When I turn to the work of this extraordinary man, I am disposed to abandon my journal.' This honourable testimony comes with the more force from an individual who has seen more of Mexico than most foreigners who have visited it. But, indeed, it is not less than is due. Full half of Mr. Poinsett's "Notes" are taken from Humboldt, including all the statistical details.* All our recent Encyclopedias are indebted to the same source for the whole of the geographical and statistical information they supply relative to this country; and it is the same with almost every work that professes to give an account of Mexico. Major Pike has, indeed, in his "Exploratory Travels," contributed some interesting particulars respecting the interior provinces. Captain Basil Hall, too, though he scarcely entered Mexico, has given some delightful sketches of the manners of the people with whom he came in contact at Tepic. Mr. Bullock has furnished a very full and amusing description of the capital and its environs, and an excellent chapter on humming birds; and Mr. Poinsett has made a very interesting volume by means of his visit to Guanajuato and his historical appendix. For the rest, our readers must go to the learned Prussian.

We have no room left to advert to the all-engrossing subject of MINES. The American Traveller does not seem to be very sanguine as to the profitable nature of mining speculations. He says, that the ore throughout Mexico is poor, the expenses of working enormous, fuel, in case of applying steam, in many

* We have noticed a few inaccuracies in the citations from Humboldt's work. Thus, in the statement of the money in mortmain, the sum in figures does not agree with the total in the text; an item of 2,000,000 of piastres, belonging to the bishoprics of Oaxaca and Merida, being omitted.

places scarce. Under the old system, he thinks that the net profits of mining throughout Spain, did not average more than 6 per cent. on the capital employed. There can be no doubt, however, that the produce of the mines is capable of being considerably increased, as well as that the expenses of working may be exceedingly reduced, by the introduction of the Cornish system of mining. Sir William Adams is very confident as to the profitable issue of the mining undertakings in which so vast a portion of British capital has been embarked; and he gives the best proof of the honest sincerity of his convictions, by retaining, through all the fluctuations of the market, all his shares. Of course, his pamphlet will be read by every one who takes any interest in the subject. For our own parts, we should prefer an iron mine to a silver mine, and a few thousand acres of corn-land to the proprietorship of the *veta madre*: but we wish the *bona-fide* share-holders all possible success and felicity.

Art. II. *Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe.*
By J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi. Translated by Thomas Roscoe, Esq. Vols. I. and II. 8vo.

(Concluded from Page 211.)

THE Sonnet, however, in spite of the warfare of critics, still maintains its honours; and to this Procrustean mould, some of our best poets have loved to commit their tenderest thoughts and finest fancies. Will it be said that the mere difficulty of the measure recommended it as a trial of skill to Milton and Shakspeare, Spenser and Drummond, Cowper and Wordsworth? Milton's fondness for the Sonnet may be traced to his admiration of Italian literature; but, on examining the few exquisite specimens he has left of this species of composition, he will be found to have adopted the sonnet as the expression of his most earnest thoughts, of the most exalted and noble sentiments. There is no air of trifling about these poems, none of the constraint of an imitator. If he imitates any poet in these compositions, it is the mighty Florentine, not the Poet of Vacluse; we allude more especially to the xvth, xvith, xviith, xviiith, and xxii^d. The one on his own Blindness, and that on his deceased wife, are the records of deep, personal feeling. In fact, from the age of three and twenty to the period of his life when his 'light was spent,' and long afterwards, he appears to have had a partiality for this graceful vehicle of poetical sentiment. Spenser, in his 'Amoretti,' has apparently

aspired to the character of an English Petrarch. He has given us eighty-eight sonnets; many of them possessing great ease and beauty, but 'love, only love the forceless numbers mean;' and it is the subject, not the measure, which has condemned them to neglect. We have often wondered that Gray, an admirer as he was of Italian literature, should have left behind him but one sonnet, and that one both faulty in its rhymes, and affected in its diction. Cowper, the reviver of the natural in poetry, is never more easy and natural than in his sonnets; and Wordsworth scarcely ever rises so high above the lake level, as in the exquisite series which he has given us.

The fact is, that the Sonnet has been brought into undeserved disgrace by being made the vehicle of inanity. But there is, besides this, a prejudice against the arbitrary law which ties down the writer to fourteen lines, neither more nor less. The reasonableness of the law is called in question, and Englishmen wish to have a reason for every thing,—more especially for every restriction on natural liberty. Why should Petrarch, who lived five hundred years ago, be allowed to give laws to English versification in the present day? It may at once be conceded, that the Petrarchan sonnet, in all its rigid exactness, is not adapted to the genius of English poetry; more especially since, with us, identical terminations do not pass for rhyme, and moreover because the two languages most essentially differ in their construction and character. But the true description of the Sonnet, and that which includes the *rationale* of the law that governs it, appears to us to be, that it is a one-stanza poem, or, if the reader please, a poem consisting of one double stanza. Its distinguishing character is its unity; and, in order to preserve this unity in the form, which should also characterise the idea, it is requisite that all the parts should be so adjusted as to depend on each other. With this view, the rhymes of the first four lines are repeated in the next four, while the last six, which wind up the thought, are in like manner interwoven; so that the whole forms a system as closely connected as the Spenserian stanza of nine lines, or the *ottava rima* stanza of eight. Three four-line stanzas with a concluding couplet, do not make a sonnet, any more than two four-line stanzas, unconnected by their rhymes, would be transformed into a Spenserian stanza by the addition of an Alexandrine. On the other hand, the precise arrangement of the rhymes in the sonnet, and the greater or less variety of termination, are of no further consequence than as these bear on the effect required,—an inter-connection and dependence of the parts, and an avoidance of what, in music, is termed a close, till the end of the harmony. If it be still asked, why should

this intricate stanza have fourteen lines, neither more nor less, we would say, let any dissatisfied poet or critic try to frame a stanza of more perfect construction and better adapted to its purpose. Less than fourteen, it will be admitted, would restrict the compass of thought to a most narrow range; for an odd thirteenth would be intolerable; and if twelve were left, they would find it difficult to arrange themselves into a graceful groupe, being too many to be embraced by one set of rhymes, and too few to divide into separate companies. But, beyond fourteen lines, it would be difficult, not to say impracticable, to preserve any thing like that unity and mutual dependence of parts, which appear to us to characterise the sonnet. Petrarch, then, we venture to think, was right, and M. Sismondi, in the objections he takes to the sonnet, wrong. When, indeed, he observes, that 'the sonnet is essentially musical,' and that 'it acts upon the mind rather through the words, than by the thoughts,'—he seems to forget, that the first remark applies equally to every species of metrical arrangement, especially to the still more complex stanzas of lyric poetry; while the other part of the sentence describes, not the sonnet specifically, but a very large proportion of exquisite poetry,—the odes of Horace and Catullus, perhaps, not less than the sonnets of Petrarch.

To return from this digression. Boccaccio, as one of the revivers of ancient learning, has claims upon the gratitude of posterity equal to those of Petrarch. He was born at Paris in 1313, the natural son of a Florentine merchant. From his earliest youth he shewed a predilection for letters, and fixed on Naples as his place of residence, where literature flourished under the protection of Robert, the reigning monarch. Having acquired the rudiments of the Greek tongue, (a rare acquisition among the scholars of that age,) he returned in 1342 to Florence. He had formed an attachment to a natural daughter of King Robert, whom he celebrates in his writings under the name of Fiammetta—an unworthy passion, to which, it is alleged, that the impure and exceptionable parts of the Decameron may be attributed, that work having been composed for her amusement. Boccaccio cultivated an intimate friendship with Petrarch, which lasted the greater part of their lives. He died in 1375.

Among the numerous works of this writer, it is the Decameron alone, which places him on a level with Dante and Petrarch, as the third member of the illustrious triumvirate to whom is to be ascribed the creation of Italian literature.

'These stories,' remarks M. Sismondi, 'which are varied with in-

finite art, as well in subject as in style, from the most pathetic and tender to the most sportive, and, unfortunately, the most licentious, exhibit a wonderful power of narration; and his description of the plague in Florence, which serves as an introduction to them, may be ranked with the most celebrated historical descriptions which have descended to us. The perfect truth of colouring; the exquisite choice of circumstances, calculated to produce the deepest impression, and which place before our eyes the most repulsive scenes, without exciting disgust; and the emotion of the writer, which insensibly pervades every part, give to this picture that true eloquence of history which, in Thucydides, animates the relation of the plague in Athens. Boccaccio had, doubtless, this model before his eyes; but the events, to which he was a witness, had vividly impressed his mind, and it was the faithful delineation of what he had seen, rather than the classical imitation, which served to develop his talent.

One cannot but pause in astonishment at the choice of so gloomy an introduction to effusions of so gay a nature. We are amazed at such an intoxicated enjoyment of life, under the threatened approach of death; at such irrepressible desire in the bosom of man to divert the mind from sorrow; and at the torrent of mirth which inundates the heart, in the midst of horrors which should seem to wither it up. As long as we feel delight in nourishing feelings that are in unison with a melancholy temperament, we have not yet felt the overwhelming weight of real sorrow. When experience has, at length, taught us the substantial griefs of life, we then first learn the necessity of resisting them; and, calling the imagination to our aid, to turn aside the shafts of calamity, we struggle with our sorrow, and treat it as an invalid, from whom we withdraw every object which may remind him of the cause of his malady. With regard to the stories themselves, it would be difficult to convey an idea of them by extracts, and impossible to preserve, in a translation, the merits of their style. The praise of Boccaccio consists in the perfect purity of his language, in his elegance, his grace, and, above all, in that *naïveté* which is the chief merit of narration, and the peculiar charm of the Italian tongue. Unfortunately, Boccaccio did not prescribe to himself the same purity in his images as in his phraseology. The character of his work is light and sportive. He has inserted in it a great number of tales of gallantry; he has exhausted his powers of ridicule on the duped husband, on the depraved and depraving monks, and on subjects, in morals and religious worship, which he himself regarded as sacred; and his reputation is thus little in harmony with the real tenor of his conduct. The Decameron was published towards the middle of the fourteenth century (in 1352 or 1353), when Boccaccio was at least thirty-nine years of age; and from the first discovery of printing, was freely circulated in Italy, until the Council of Trent proscribed it, in the middle of the sixteenth century. At the solicitation of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and after two remarkable negotiations between this Prince and Popes Pius V. and Sixtus V., the Decameron was again published, in 1573 and 1582, purified and corrected.' Vol. II. pp. 6—8.

A striking coincidence is observable between the literary fortunes of Petrarch and of Boccaccio. Petrarch looked for immortality from works of learning, composed in one of the ancient languages; but he derived it from works which he either despised or affected to despise,—from the mere playthings of his imagination. In like manner, Boccaccio held his Decameron in no esteem, having composed it, he tells us, only for the solace of the ladies, who, at that time, led a very dismal life; but his reputation rests upon those very tales which he undervalued, and which, in his declining age, were sources of religious self-upbraidings. Before his time, tales were merely subjects of social mirth. He first transported them into literature, and added elegance of diction, and the charms of narration, to the simpler delight afforded by the old narrators. The description of the plague at Florence, is one of the best historical descriptions extant. It is impossible not to be struck with the endless variety of the tales. Many of them breathe an air of free, unrestrained licentiousness and gayety; but a large proportion of them are pathetic, or replete with comic humour of the most innocent kind. This variety constitutes the great charm of the Decameron; and what is truly admirable is, that in each of these styles, the narration is equally easy, natural, and flowing; while the consistency of every person is preserved with a dramatic fidelity, and the dialogue is so true to the several speakers, that each of them keeps, from the beginning to the end, the distinctive traits of his character. Tricking and licentious priests, at that time no extraordinary phenomena, monks devoted to sensuality and lewdness, credulous and outwitted husbands, young people caring for nothing but pleasure, old men and old women thinking of nothing but money, frank and courteous cavaliers, pirates, hermits, counterfeits of sham miracles, in a word, *hoc genus omne*;—these are the figures that are rapidly presented by this most delightful of magic lanterns in an ever new and pleasing succession.

Two poets of the fourteenth century, who followed this great triumvirate, obtained some degree of celebrity; Fazio de' Uberti, and Federigo Frezzi. Each chose Dante for his model,—a vain ambition; the former in his *Dettamondo*, a description of the universe; the other in his *Quadriregio*, or four empires of Love, Satan, Vice, and Virtue: both poems are servile imitations of their illustrious model. To our great surprise, M. Sismondi has passed them over without a single remark. But they have many beauties, and of the highest order. The hackneyed trick of a vision,—a most insipid vehicle, which nothing can animate but the extraordinary and

creative energies of the poet, was probably the weight which sank these productions so low in general estimation. The personification of Rome, however, in the *Dettamondo*, is scarcely unworthy of Dante himself. The *Quadriregio*, though in every respect inferior, has been more generally read.

The warm sunshine of the court of Lorenzo de' Medici brought into life two poems, or chivalrous romances in verse; the *Morgante Maggiore* of Pulci, a Florentine, and the *Orlando Innamorato* of Boiardo. The great merit of these poets, is, that they prepared the way for Ariosto in a new mode of poetical composition,—the mixture of humour with fabulous narrative. Ariosto produced his *Orlando Furioso* in 1516, and it was received with the most lively enthusiasm.

'The *Orlando Furioso*,' says M. Sismondi, 'is a poem universally known. It has been translated into all the modern tongues; and by the sole charm of its adventures, independently of its poetry, has long been the delight of the youth of all countries. It may therefore be taken for granted, that all the world is aware that Ariosto undertook to sing the Paladins and their amours at the court of Charlemagne, during the fabulous wars of this monarch against the Moors. If it were required to assign an historical epoch to the events contained in this poem, we must place them before the year 778, when Orlando was slain at the battle of Roncesvalles, in an expedition which Charlemagne made, before he was emperor, to defend the frontiers of Spain. But it may be conjectured, that the romance-writers have confounded the wars of Charles Martel against Abdelrahman, with those of Charlemagne; and have thus given rise to the traditions of the invasion of France by the Saracens, and of those unheard of perils, from which the West of Europe was saved by the valour of the Paladins. Every reader knows, that Orlando, of all the heroes of Ariosto the most renowned for his valour, became mad, through love for Angelica; and that his madness, which is only an episode in this long poem, has given its name to the whole of the composition, although it is not until the twenty-third canto that Orlando is deprived of his senses.'

* * * * *

'The poem of Ariosto is only a fragment of the history of the knights of Charlemagne and their amours; and it has neither beginning nor end, further than any particular detached period may be said to possess them. This want of unity essentially injures the interest and the general impression which we ought to derive from the work. But the avidity with which all nations, and all ages, have read Ariosto, even when his story is despoiled of its poetic charms by translation, sufficiently proves that he had the art of giving to its individual parts an interest which it does not possess as a whole. Above all, he has communicated to it a spirit of valour. In spite of the habitual absurdity of those chivalrous combats; in spite of the disproportion of the causes with their effects, and the raillery which seems inseparable from the narration of his battles, Ariosto

always contrives to excite in us an enthusiasm and an intoxication of valour which create a love of enterprise in every reader. One of the most exalted enjoyments of man, consists in the full development of his energies and power. The great art of the poet of romance is, to awaken a proper confidence in our own resources, by raising against his hero all the forces of nature and the spells of magic, and by exhibiting him as triumphant, by the superiority of his will and courage, over all the powers which had conspired his ruin.

‘In the world into which Ariosto transports us, we find also another source of enjoyment. This world, essentially poetic, in which all the vulgar interests of life are suspended; where love and honour are the only laws and the only motives to action, and no factitious wants, no cold calculations chill the soul; where all the pains and all the inquietudes incident to our lot, and the inequalities of rank and of riches are forgotten; this imaginary world charms away all our cares. We delight in making excursions into it, and in discovering in it a refuge from the distractions of real life. We derive, indeed, no instruction from these reveries; for the difference between the world of romance and the real world is such, that we cannot, in the one, make the least use of the lessons received from the other. It is, in fact, a remarkable characteristic of this species of poetry, that it is impossible to derive from it any kind of instruction.’

We wish that M. Sismondi had stopped here. The remark with which he closes the paragraph, is, we are persuaded, far from being even philosophically, much less morally correct.

We must omit several names in M. Sismondi's catalogue, and pass over to Torquato Tasso, who, at an early age, produced that, of which Italy had hitherto been deemed incapable, an epic poem. He devoted sixteen years to its composition. Such was the avidity with which it was read on its appearance, that seven editions of it were printed in one year, 1581. The merit of the “Jerusalem delivered” consists greatly in its subject,—the memorable struggle between the Christians and the Saracens during the Crusades. A theme better adapted to the highest poetic effect could not have been selected, and the whole course of the poem is truly epic,—‘entire, simple, grand.’ M. Sismondi, admitting the distinction between the romantic and the classical styles of poetry, judiciously shews that Tasso was indebted to each.

‘But Tasso has shewn how a man of powerful genius, uniting the two kinds, might be, at once, classical in the plan, and romantic in the painting of manners and situation. His poem was conceived in the spirit of antiquity, and executed in the spirit of the middle ages. Our customs, our education, the most touching passages in our histories, and, perhaps, even the tales of our nursery, always carry us back to the times and manners of chivalry. Every thing connected with that age awakens our sensibility. Every thing, on the contrary,

that is derived from the mythological times of antiquity, acts only on our memory. The two epochs of civilization were each preceded by their heroic ages. The Greeks ascended to the companions of Hercules, and we look back to the Paladins of Charlemagne. These two races of heroes are, perhaps, alike the creation of the imagination in a later age; but it is exactly this which renders their relation the more true to the age that has created them. The heroic ages form the ideal of succeeding times. We seek in them the model of perfection, which is most in unison with our opinions, our prejudices, our domestic sentiments, politics, and religion. It is, consequently, by a reference to this heroism, that poetry is enabled to exercise her power more strongly over the mind or the heart. Poetry, at least that of the first class, has the same object as every other branch of art. It transports us from the real into an ideal world. All the fine arts seek to retrace those primitive forms of beauty which are not found in the visible world, but the impression of which is fixed in our minds, as the model by which to regulate our judgment. It is not a correct opinion, that the Venus of Apelles was only a combination of all that the painter found most perfect in the most beautiful women. Her image existed in the mind of the artist before this combination. It was after this image that he selected subjects for the various parts. This original image could alone harmonize the various models which he consulted; and this assistance, purely mechanical, to retrace the most beautiful forms, served only to develop his own conception, the idea of beauty, as it is conceived by the mind, and as it can never be identified in any individual form.

In the same manner, we find an ideal image of the beauty of character, of conduct, of passion, and I had almost said, of crime, which has not been combined from different individuals; which is not the fruit of observation or of comparison; but which previously subsists in our own mind, and may be considered as the base of our poetic principles. Observation shews us that this idea is not the same in all nations. It is modified by general, and often by unknown causes, which seem to arise almost as much from diversity of origin as from education. The French knight possesses, in our imagination, a different character from that of the knight of Italy, Spain, England, or Germany; and all these champions of modern times differ still more from the heroes of antiquity, and bear the marks of the Romantic race, formed from the mixture of Germans and Latins. We easily portray, to our own minds, the modern hero, whose characteristics are universally recognised by all European nations; but we cannot form a just conception of the hero of antiquity, and are obliged to delineate his character from memory and classical recollections, and not from our individual feelings. It is this circumstance, which gives so cold an air to the classical poems of modern times. In the romantic species, the appeal is made directly to our own hearts; in the classical, it seems requisite to consult our books, and to have every feeling and idea justified by a quotation from an ancient author.

‘ We have admired, in Tasso, the antique cast of his poem, and that beauty which results from the unity and regularity of design, and from the harmony of all its parts. But this merit, the principal one, perhaps, in our eyes, is not that which has rendered his work so popular. It is its romantic form, which harmonizes with the sentiments, the passions, and the recollections of Europeans. It is because he celebrates heroes whose type exists in their hearts, that he is celebrated in his turn by the gondoliers of Venice; that a whole people cherish his memory; and that, in the nights of summer, the mariners interchange the sorrows of Erminia and the death of Clorinda.’ Vol. II. pp. 159—162.

The pathetic story of Tasso’s adversities, is very impressively related by M. Sismondi, but the circumstances must be familiar to our readers. We have no room to notice the *Amyntas* and other minor works of Tasso, amounting, with his “*Jerusalem Delivered*,” to twelve quarto volumes; but must pass on to Berni, distinguished among the Italian poets of the sixteenth century, as the inventor of a new species of poetry, which has retained his name,—the light and elegant mockery of which he set the example, being still called *bernesque*.

‘ The gayety,’ remarks M. Sismondi, ‘ with which he recounts serious events, without rendering them vulgar, is not confounded by his countrymen with the burlesque, to which it is so nearly allied. It is, above all, in the *Orlando Innamorato* of the Count Boiardo, remodelled by Berni in a free and lively style, that we perceive the fullness of his genius. His other works, imbued, perhaps, with more comic wit, trespass too frequently on the bounds of propriety. Francesco Berni was born about 1490, at Lamporecchio, a castle between Florence and Pistoia. We know little more of his biography than what he relates himself, in a jesting tone, in the sixty-seventh canto of his *Orlando Innamorato*. He was of a noble, but not opulent family. At nineteen years of age, he went to Rome, full of confidence in the protection of Cardinal Dovizio da Bibbiena, who, in fact, took little interest in his welfare. After the death of that prelate, being always embarrassed, he entered as secretary into the Apostolic Datary. He there found the means of life, but was oppressed by an irksome employ, to which he was never reconciled. His labours increased, in proportion as he gave less satisfaction. He carried under his arms, in his bosom, and in his pockets, whole packets of letters, to which he never found time to reply. His revenues were small, and when he came to collect them, he frequently found, according to his own expressions, that storms, water, fire, or the devil, had swept them entirely away. His mirth, and the verses and tales which he recited, made him an acceptable member of society; but, whatever love he might have had for liberty, he remained always in a state of dependence. By his satires he made himself many enemies, the most vindictive of whom was Pietro Aretino, whom he, in turn, did not spare. Berni, who informs us that his greatest pleasure was

lying in bed and doing nothing, experienced, if we are to believe common rumour, a death more tragic than we should have been led to expect from his situation in life. He was the common friend of the Cardinal Ippolito and the Duke Alessandro de' Medici, who were cousins-german, and was solicited by the latter of these to poison his relation. As he refused to participate in so black a crime, he was himself poisoned a few days afterwards, in the year 1536. In the same year, the Cardinal Ippolito was, in fact, poisoned by his cousin."

Vol. II. pp. 215—218.

Berni's taste had been formed by a diligent study of the ancients. His *rifacimento* of the Orlando Innamorato has so completely superseded the original, that no one ever thinks of Boiardo; and its popularity is easily accounted for. His pleasantries are almost irresistible, and he has always had a large party of admirers, who rank him with the most eminent poets of Italy. Every thing in his hands is transformed into the ridiculous; his satire knows no bounds. His object was, to excite a laugh, and provided he attained it, he was not restrained by any scruple of morality or decorum. He laughs at chivalry, even more than Ariosto does. Not that he has burlesqued the poem of Boiardo; it is the same romance told in good earnest, but told by a man who cannot refrain from laughing all the while he is telling it. The versification is laboured; the wit profusely scattered; the gayety more sportive than Ariosto's, though, with respect to imagination, colouring, richness, all that constitutes true poetry, the two poems will not bear a comparison.

The next name that occurs, is a far more illustrious one; the eloquent historian and subtle politician, Macchiavelli. Born at Florence in 1469, from his earliest manhood he was employed in public affairs. In the midst of these grave occupations, however, he cultivated his satiric talent, and composed some comedies, his novel of Belfagor, re-modelled in French by la Fontaine, and some tolerable sonnets. Having been employed on an embassy to the court of Cæsar Borgia, he had ample leisure for studying the crooked policy of that illustrious villain. He owed his elevation to the party in opposition to the Medici; and when the latter were recalled in 1512, Macchiavelli was banished. Having joined in a plot against the usurpers, he was seized, and put to the torture; but nothing in crimination of either himself or his associates was extorted from him. He was set at liberty by Leo X. Hence arose his hatred of princes, whom he took a pleasure in painting as he had seen them, in a work professedly written for their instruction, with that profound knowledge of the human heart, and

with the great skill he had acquired of unfolding the intricate thread of their perfidious dissimulation.

‘ He dedicated his treatise of the *Principe*, not to Lorenzo the Magnificent, as Bouterwek, by a strange anachronism, has stated, but to Lorenzo, duke of Urbino, the proud usurper of the liberties of Florence and of the estates of his benefactor, the former Duke of Urbino, of the house of Rovere. Lorenzo thought himself profound when he was crafty, and energetic when he was cruel; and Machiavelli, in shewing, in his treatise of the *Principe*, how an able usurper, who is not restrained by any moral principle, may consolidate his power, gave to the duke instructions conformable to his taste. The true object, however, of Machiavelli could not be to secure on his throne a tyrant whom he hated, and against whom he had conspired. Nor is it probable that he only proposed to himself, to expose to the people the maxims of tyranny, in order to render them odious; for an universal experience had, at that time, made them known throughout all Italy, and that diabolical policy, which Machiavelli reduced to a system, was, in the sixteenth century, that of all the states. There is, in his manner of treating the subject, a general feeling of bitterness against mankind, and a contempt of the human race, which induces him to address it in language adapted to its despicable and depraved condition. He applies himself to the interests and selfish calculations of mankind, since they do not deserve an appeal to their enthusiasm and moral sense. He establishes principles in theory, which he knows his readers will reduce to practice; and he exhibits the play of the human passions with an energy and clearness which require no ornament.’

We entirely agree with M. Sismondi in considering his Discourses on Livy as his best and profoundest work. It has been ever since resorted to as a treasury of political maxims, founded on an exact estimate of human nature and human motives. His history of Florence is the true eloquence of history: it is an admirable delineation of popular passions and factious tumults, and exhibits a masterly analysis of the human heart. He died in 1527, having left three comedies, which, M. Sismondi says, for novelty of plot, vivacity of dialogue, and delineation of character, are far superior to all that Italy had then, or, perhaps, has since produced. In each of them, he exposed sanctimonious hypocrisy with a strength and fidelity, which left nothing to the invention of the Author of *Tartuffe*.

M. Sismondi concludes his review of the Italian Literature of the sixteenth century, with some remarks on the progress of the comic drama. But, amid a host of comic authors, 5000 of whose dramas were, according to Riccobino, printed between the years 1500 and 1736, not one truly comic genius seems to have arisen in Italy. In the sixteenth century, mountebanks and empirics attempted to represent farces of a greater

length than the ordinary dialogue then in vogue between a quack and his buffoon; and thus, they assumed, by degrees, the form of a comedy. These pieces were partly extemporaneous; but a certain character was assigned to each actor, with the outline of the part he was to play. Hence, the invention of the masks of Pantaloon, Harlequin, and Columbine, to whom three succeeding centuries have been indebted for the pleasures of buffoonery.

The decline of Italian literature in the seventeenth century, is called by the Italians, the age of *Seicentisti*. A few writers, however, resisted the torrent of bad taste, whose names, as well as the names of those who indulged in extravagance and false refinements, are recorded by M. Sismondi. This perverted taste was first perceived in the latter part of the preceding century. Guarini may be said to belong to both of these epochs. His *Pastor Fido* was represented, for the first time, in 1585. We cannot insert our Author's analysis of this poem, which Guarini extended into more than 6000 lines. He has hardly, we think, rendered sufficient justice to the *Pastor Fido* in the following strictures.

'We can scarcely, at this period, conceive how so long a piece could have been represented. From the language of the dialogue, the trifling thoughts, and common places, and the flatness of the action, we easily gather that Guarini formed no idea of any impatience in the spectators, nor thought himself obliged to awaken their curiosity, and to rivet their attention to the story. Nor was he acquainted with the art, so important in the eyes of modern French critics, of connecting the different scenes, and of assigning probable motives for the appearance and disappearance of the persons of the drama. Each scene is, for the most part, a separate act, with very little reference, either in action, or in time and place, to that which immediately precedes it; and this want of consistency, as a whole, throws an air of singular coldness over the first act, consisting of five scenes, which unconnectedly follow each other in the manner of five different plots. The versification of the *Pastor Fido* appears to me even more pleasing than that of the *Amyntas*. Guarini gave exquisite grace and harmony to his verses; passing, without effort or abruptness, from the *versi sciolti* to measures the most varied and complex. Indeed, no prose could have conveyed his sentiments more accurately; while no species of lyric poetry, in the ode or in the canzone, display a happier combination of rhymes, or a greater variety of feet, both regular and free. The piece is, perhaps, more deficient in spirit than in poetry; the sentiments are often trite; and the author attempts to disguise his want of originality by frequent affectation and conceit. Its chief attraction, and which very much contributed to its success, is the poetical exhibition of the passion of love, the source of the various incidents throughout the entire action of the piece, throwing its voluptuous charm equally over the poet, the actors, and the spectators.'

Among a tribe of petty versifiers, Filaccaia stands almost alone, a poet of strong and manly conceptions,—a monument in the desert. He was born at Florence in 1642, and died in 1707. The spark of ancient freedom in his generous bosom, survived the degeneracy of his age. The wars of the succession, and the calamities of the unhappy times on which he had fallen, inspired him with a lofty spirit of poetical enthusiasm. Of his sonnets, M. Sismondi has inserted his beautiful, but indignant appeal to Italy, as the best specimen of Italian poetry which the seventeenth century affords. It is elegantly rendered by Mr. Roscoe.

‘ Italia! thou to whom, in evil hour,
The fatal boon of beauty Nature gave,
Yet on thy front the sentence did engrave,
That ceaseless woe should be thy only dower!
Ah! were that beauty less, or more thy power!
That he who now compels thee to his arms,
Might gaze with cold indifference on thy charms,
Or tremble at thine eye’s indignant lower.
Thou should’st not, then, behold, in glittering line,
From the high Alps embattled throngs descend,
And Gallic hordes pollute thy Po’s clear wave,
Nor, whilst encompass’d close by spears, not thine,
Should’st thou by foreign hands thy rights defend,
Conquering or conquer’d, evermore a slave.’

The remaining sonnets of this Poet, M. Sismondi does not consider to be of equal merit. Has he not overlooked the vigorous sonnet addressed to Fortune? We are strongly tempted to offer a translation of it, which, if it has no other praise, deserves that at least of being faithful to the original.

‘ If they, O Fortune, who thy power adore,
Prudence and Honour for thy gifts resign,
I thank thee that thy hatred has been mine,
And that thou keep’st the oath thy anger swore.
For thro’ this life, be mine or less or more,
In poverty and sorrow I may pine,
But will not bow me at thine idol shrine,
The riches which I prize not, to implore.
I ask not peace with thee; thy darts of hate
At me unspar’d, unbated still may fly;
Thy love, and not thy wrath, I deprecate;
For *this* I have defied, and will defy.
Wisdom and virtue shun the fortunate,
But comfort to the wretched eye is nigh.’

We reluctantly omit all mention of Metastasio, Goldoni, Gozzi, Pindamonti, and many other distinguished names in the

eighteenth century. This article, already protracted beyond our ordinary limits, must close with Alfieri.

Italian comedy made considerable advances under Goldoni, Gozzi, and Albergati, during the early part of the eighteenth century; but Tragedy, in the mean time, with the exception of Maffei's *Merope*, was silent. Metastasio, the favourite poet of the nation, had diffused a universal taste for that voluptuous but sickly poetry, which 'overpowers by its inebriating sweetness,' and by its gorgeous richness of imagery.

'Italy has, however,' remarks M. Sismondi, 'in our own days, given birth to a man, who, beyond any other, was calculated by his virtues, and by his defects, to perceive the errors of Metastasio; to despise his effeminacy; to ridicule his stage effect, his suspended daggers, his love confidants, and all the factitious system which he had introduced on the stage. The Count Vittorio Alfieri, of Asti, has himself acquainted us, in his *Confessions*, with his own fierce and aspiring character, impatient of all restraint, violent, an enemy to repose, and to a mode of life which had enervated his fellow-countrymen. He regarded effeminacy as a public crime, and blamed Metastasio more for having corrupted the Italians, than for not adopting the true rules of tragedy. As soon as the predilections of his youth began to calm, and he had discontinued traversing Europe, more as a courier than as a tourist, his first verses were dictated by indignation. He had an exalted idea of the duties and the dignity of man; an ardent love of liberty and of all the noble actions to which it has given birth; a singular ignorance, which did not allow him to judge correctly of the government of any country, and which led him to confound the dissolution of all the bonds of society with that freedom after which he sighed; and an inveterate hatred of that system of tyranny in the governments around him, which had degraded mankind. This, indeed, might be called a personal hatred, since he shared and felt more acutely than any other individual, that humiliation which for so long a time had debased the Italians.

'Metastasio was the poet of love; Alfieri, of freedom. All the pieces of the latter have a political tendency, and owe their eloquence, their warmth, and their rapidity, to the powerful sentiment which possessed the poet, and compelled him to write from the impulse of his soul. Alfieri did not possess the requisite talent for tragedy. His vivid emotions were not derived from his imagination, but solely from his feelings. He did not change places with his hero, to be himself moved by varied impressions; he remains always himself; and from this circumstance he is more deficient than any writer in variety of incident, and often degenerates into monotony. But, before we inquire whether we should allow his productions the title of fine tragedies, we ought, as a celebrated female has observed, when we consider the circumstances of his life, to regard them as actions commanding our admiration.

'The creation of a new Italian drama by Alfieri, is a phenomenon which strikes us with astonishment. Before his time, the Italians

were inferior to all the nations of Europe in the dramatic art. Alfieri has ranged himself by the side of the great French tragedians; and he shares with them the advantages which they possess over all others. He has united the beauties of art, unity, singleness of subject, and probability, the properties of the French drama, to the sublimity of situation and character, and the important events of the Greek theatre, and to the profound thought and sentiment of the English stage. He has rescued tragedy from the saloons of courts, to which the manners of the reign of Louis XIV. had restricted her; he has introduced her to councils, to public places, to the state; and he has given to the most elevated of poetical productions, the most noble, the most important general interest. He has annihilated the conventional forms which substituted a ridiculous affectation for the sublimity of nature; the gallantry derived from the old French romances, which exhibits the heroes of Greece and Rome under a preposterous disguise; the honied sweetness and pastoral languor which, since the time of Guarini, represented all the heroic characters on the Italian stage with effeminate sentiments and manners; the affectation of chivalry and valour, which, on the Spanish stage, attaching life itself to a delicate and scrupulous point of honour, converts the loftiest characters into braves, eager to destroy each other. The gallantry of romances, the effminacy of pastorals, the point of honour of chivalry, appeared to him so many masks imposed upon nature, under which all true feelings and passions were concealed from view. He has torn off these masks, and has exhibited on the stage man in his real greatness, and in his true relations. If in this new conception of tragedy he has sometimes erred, if he has abandoned himself to exaggeration, and to a violence natural to his own character, he has still effected enough to claim our admiration. The writers who have succeeded him, and who have profited from the grandeur of his style, without incurring his peculiar faults, sufficiently prove the progress which the Italian drama made under him, and how highly it stands indebted to his genius.' Vol. II. pp. 457—460.

We frankly confess, that the dramatic excellence of Alfieri, is not an article of our literary faith. The principles of his drama are absolutely false. Alfieri, it is true, disdained the softness and the mellifluous refinements of Metastasio. His hatred of the general servility and corruption of his age, breathes in the indignant diction of his dialogue, and the stoical pride of his sentiments. But stoicism is not poetry, and an unrelieved, unmitigated vehemence of thought and expression will never powerfully affect the heart. The rough and abrupt language of Alfieri, from which, in conformity to his own theory of tragic composition, he thought fit to exclude all figurative diction, makes his characters appear quite devoid of imagination. His native dialect is despoiled, by this cold and artificial process of its natural charms. The harmony, without which poetry becomes a heavy and monotonous accumulation of

verse, is so far from being ambitiously wooed by this eccentric Poet, that he wounds the ear with the harshest dissonance. The region of tragedy is indeed exalted far above the grossness of sensual pleasure; but the seductions of life are not to be excluded from the tragic scene, to make way for a cold, unbending virtue, the ideal virtue of the schools, which warred alike against the passions and the affections, and reduced man to the 'mere spectre of humanity.' In reading a tragedy of Alfieri, we seem transported into those Arctic climes, where nature seems to repose as in her sepulchre, and the whole face of things is cold, dark, and desolate. The fewness of his personages, who rarely exceed four, contributes to the same melancholy impression of a sombre, depopulated drama, deprived of all the bustling and stirring agency which gives life and interest to the poet's scenes. Metastasio is justly reproached with sameness of character and of incident. It is precisely what Alfieri, with a perfect indifference to public criticism, avows to be the defect of his own tragedies. 'Whoever,' says he, 'is acquainted with the structure of one, is acquainted with 'them all.' His characters are a sort of moral skeletons, if we may be allowed the phrase,—lifeless abstractions of virtue or of crime. His villains shew their dispositions without the slightest disguise; and his virtuous personages are neither pleasing nor interesting. M. Sismondi observes, that Alfieri's motives were judicious for banishing confidants from the stage. These speaking automata are, it is true, sufficiently ridiculous; a sort of dramatic hooks on which the heroines hang a long story which the poor creatures must have heard often enough to know by heart. But he has not introduced in their room any secondary personages, who might have taken an inferior, but direct interest in the action, and would not have been the mere shadow of others. Alfieri takes credit to himself for having greatly diversified his personages, and given tyrants, conspirators, queens, and lovers, their separate and appropriate characters. 'I much doubt,' says M. Sismondi, whom we are happy to find not much at variance with ourselves in our general estimate of this poet,

'whether this merit will be so fully appreciated by his readers as by Alfieri himself. On the contrary, there prevails in the tragedies of Alfieri a great monotony. Not only characters of the same class are mingled together, but even those which belong to different classes, bear a resemblance to each other, and they all partake of the mind of the author. He himself was a man of too passionate, too caustic, and too independent a character, easily to adopt the sentiments and thoughts of another. From the beginning to the end of his pieces,

we may trace in him the sworn foe of tyrants, the enemy of corruption, and, apparently, the enemy of all established forms of society; and as his style is always constrained and concise, almost to affectation, the expression of the sentiments, and the sentiments themselves, have too frequent and too great resemblance.' p. 470.

The play selected for analysis by M. Sismondi, is the Philip II., a subject well suited to Alfieri's genius;—the portraiture of the darkest monster of modern times, a tyrant, 'who for a 'long time,' remarks Madame de Stael, 'impressed his own 'character on that of the Spanish nation,'—and the disastrous passion of his son Don Carlos. Isabella, in a soliloquy, reproaches herself with her own love for the young prince, when Carlos enters and implores her compassion. Mr. Roscoe has adopted Mr. Charles Lambe's energetic version of this tragedian.

' Ah! thou art ignorant of my father's nature,
And may kind Heaven that ignorance prolong!
The treacherous intrigues of an impious court
To thee are all unknown. An upright heart
Could not believe, much less such guilt imagine.
More cruel than the sycophantic train
Surrounding him, 'tis Philip that abhors me.
He sets the example to the servile crowd;
His wrathful temper chafes at nature's ties:
Yet do I not forget that he's my father.
If for one day I could forget that tie,
And rouse the slumbers of my smother'd wrongs,
Never, oh never, should he hear me mourn
My ravish'd honours, my offended fame,
His unexampled and unnatural hate.
No, of a wrong more deep I would upbraid him:
He took my all the day he tore thee from me.'

Before they part, Isabella avows her passion in an expression which she utters in her agitation, but which Carlos readily understands. In the second act, Philip, who harbours suspicions of his queen, instructs Gomez to observe her during a conversation which he is about to have with her. She enters. He charges his son with treason in supporting the rebels; but his words are artfully broken in such a way as to convince her that their mutual attachment is no secret. Yet, when the prince is accused, she defends him eloquently and courageously. The king appears convinced, sends for Carlos, and alarms him by the same artifices. This double examination, which is really terrific, terminates with a kind of short-hand scene, in four verses, replete with quick and sudden reciprocations between Philip and Gomez.

Phil. Heard'st thou?

Gom. I heard.

Phil. Sawest thou?

Gom. I saw.

Phil. Oh, rage!

Then, then, suspicion—

Gom. Now is certainty.

Phil. And Philip yet is unrevenge?

Gom. Reflect—

Phil. I have reflected. Follow thou my footsteps.'

Carlos is tried by the Inquisition in the third act, and adjudged to death. After an interview between Gomez and Carlos, in the fourth, which contributes little to the action, beyond unfolding the cruel dissimulation of the minister; and another between Gomez and the queen, during which he perfidiously assures her that he will introduce her to Carlos; the fifth act opens with the prison, where Carlos is awaiting his fate with great fortitude. Isabella enters, urges him to flee, and tells him that Gomez has prepared every thing for his escape. Carlos in a moment perceives the horrible snare into which both had been betrayed, undeceives her, and exhorts her to flee while there is yet time, to save her honour, and to remove all pretext for the ferocious revenge of the king. Whilst she hesitates, Philip enters.

'He expresses a savage joy in having them both completely in his power. He has been acquainted with their passion from its commencement, and has observed the progress of it, unknown to themselves. His jealousy is not of the heart, but of offended pride, and he now avows it. Carlos attempts to justify Isabella, but she rejects all excuse; she asks for death to liberate her from this horrible palace; she provokes Philip by exasperating language; and Alfieri here again places his own feelings, and his own expressions of hatred, in the mouths of his personages. Gomez returns, bearing a cup, and a poniard still reeking with the blood of Perez. Philip offers to the two lovers the choice of the dagger or the bowl. Carlos chooses the dagger, and strikes himself a mortal blow. Isabella congratulates herself on dying, and Philip, to punish her the more, condemns her to life; but she snatches from the person of the king his own dagger, and kills herself in her turn. This stage trick appears to me to be beneath the dignity of Alfieri. A king is not easily robbed of his poniard, and it was scarcely worth while to calculate the action so nicely, if the catastrophe was to depend on the chance of Isabella finding herself on the right, instead of the left side of the king; and on the poniard of the king, if he carried one, not being fastened in his girdle, or hidden by the folds of his dress.' pp. 492—5.

We could have wished, that M. Sismondi had entered at length into the comparison, which he has promised us in a

future volume, between Alfieri's Philip II., and the Don Carlos of Schiller. He has, however, said enough to shew that he greatly prefers the tragedy of the Italian poet,—a judgement from which we entirely dissent. With Alfieri, this portion of the work abruptly terminates; and we shall reserve any general remarks on its literary character, till we have an opportunity of examining the sequel.

Art. III. *Journal of a Tour in France in the Years 1816 and 1817.*
By Frances Jane Carey. 8vo. pp. 502. Price 14s. London, 1823.

MAN has been well defined by Paley to be a bundle of habits; these constitute his individuality as detached from the species in general, and they are the grand distinctive colours which separate nations and countries from each other. Cross a river, or a mountain, or an arm of the ocean, and a new and unexpected system of manners,—new modes of life,—a new series of conventional usages burst upon you. The old and experienced traveller contemplates with little surprise and no emotion, the strong contrasts which are perpetually springing up before him in the varied progress of his wayfarings. Upon the sensitive organs of youth, but more especially upon the female mind, which, in its tastes and its movements, is always youthful, the impressions made by such sudden and rapid changes, are deep and vehement. All is surprise and delight, so soon as this new world reveals itself in its first gloss and freshness. It can hardly be conceived by those whom long and frequent wanderings over the continent have deadened to the excitements of curiosity,—in whom, all that it presents, raises only an imperfect worn-out enjoyment, as if the chace after novelty were completely run down, and nothing remained either to stimulate or to gratify expectation,—with what a restless, delighted eye and beating and enlivened heart, the untravelled stranger hails the objects that rush upon his senses, when he first arrives in a foreign country.

Now the heart is not constructed for unparticipated satisfactions. There is a moral surfeit in every pleasure which is not imparted; but that which is communicated to others, is usuriously paid back, and becomes a redoubled enjoyment. It may be questioned, even in spite of the vaunted raptures of musing in the realms of stillness and solitude, where no voice is echoed but that of the brawling stream or of the mountain torrent,—whether these 'lone enthusiasts' are contented to brood over the undivided hoard of their melancholy satisfactions; or whe-

ther the secret charm that soothes them, be not the pouring out to other bosoms, those communings with nature in her wilds and retirements, which have so sweetly solaced their own. However this may be, every one must have felt the delight of telling others of the new attitudes and new scenes of life which he has witnessed. Vanity, a great sharer in all our enjoyments, takes her part in this. By having seen what others have never seen, and coming in contact with groupes of mankind or spots of the globe, which others can know only through a secondary medium, we are conscious of something like superiority over those to whom the same opportunities have been denied. We feel somewhat as Gulliver did, on his return from Brobdingnag;—a fallacious sensation of looking over other peoples' heads, from the mere advantage of having been conversant with objects from which they are shut out.

Who, therefore, is there, that can feel it within him, to frown down with the austere brow of criticism, these appetencies to communication, that seem to be a part of our nature, and prompt us, when the heart is delighted, to share its overflowings with our correspondents at home, or the family groupe who sympathize in the fortunes and incidents of our travel? It is from this not unamiable feeling, we truly believe, rather than from the mere vanity of appearing in print, that so many continental tourists of both sexes, begin, as soon as Dover pier recedes from their eyes, to think of consigning their raptures to paper. Unluckily, there are few perils to be encountered in crossing the channel; and that source of romantic delight is closed till they reach the Alps or the Glaciers. But the new manners, the new dresses, the new style of houses, the new cookery, all that gushes forth upon them in the first bewildered gaze of astonishment, are immediately discharged into their journal, which is forthwith forwarded to satisfy the indulgent circle of aunts or cousins or sisters, who, having first sated themselves with its contents, find little need to use much coaxing or entreaty to persuade the liberal traveller not to cast his treasure to the waters, but to add it to the already redundant heap of modern travels.

One thing seems to be overlooked by these most amiable and communicative of beings;—that all that can be communicated of a country so near in intercourse to our own, and whose soil is so much trodden by our countrymen and countrywomen as France, has already appeared in the varied shapes of quarto or octavo, journals and tours, till no gleaning is left to repay the curiosity of those who read to be amused, and all is barren of sentiment or description from Dan to Beersheba. A journey from London to Bristol or York, or even to Acton or Ealing,

would furnish nearly an equal number of subjects for meditation. In fact, we know not whether an inquiring eye and an intelligent head would not put up a greater abundance of game within the short compass of those expeditions; for that which is within our reach, is passed by unnoticed, however pregnant with reflection to those who know how to turn every thing they meet with to intellectual profit. Mrs. Frances Jane Carey is a sensible, matron-like lady. She performed her journey through France in 1816 and 1817, but unluckily deferred her publication till 1823; a period when her remarks must of necessity have lost that freshness and novelty which would have made them useful and entertaining, had they appeared when the long-suspended intercourse of the two countries was first renewed. However just or sagacious, therefore, they may be, they cannot, at this time of day, atone for their adding to the crying inconvenience of the number of printed books. That a *sou* is five centimes, that a *franc* is 20 *sous*, and a Napoleon 20 *francs*;—that a *poste* is two French leagues (rather a short allowance);—are pieces of information which are, at present, 'none of the newest.' Nor are the whip and spur remarks which she makes upon the places which she visits, much calculated to enlarge our stock of information concerning what, if examined and described at all, ought not to be hastily examined or perfunctorily described. As a sample of this touch-and-go kind of travel-writing, let us take our fair Tourist's description of Caen, a city not of inferior note to any in France, rich in architectural monuments, interesting antiquities, and historical recollections. It is not that we object to notices of places and things in a book of travels, merely because they are summary and comprehensive. They who have read the best and most philosophical book of travels which has, perhaps, ever yet appeared, we mean Forsyth's Italy,—will have observed how rapidly the Author dismisses his topics, and describes what he seems to see only at a glance; but, in that glance, how much has his eye taken in;—in that rapid description, how much is described!

* Caen, formerly the capital of Lower Normandy, is a very large old town, situated in an extensive plain, at the junction of the little river Odin with the Orne, which empties itself into the English Channel a few leagues below, and has been made navigable to the town for vessels of small burden, which are towed along by horses.

* The cathedral is very large and handsome. William the Conqueror was buried in the choir; but no monument of him is to be seen, except a flat marble tomb-stone, which has lately been placed there, with his name engraved upon it. Several other fine old churches still remain, and many have been destroyed.

* The public walks are exceedingly pleasant, between rows of handsome elms, on the banks of the river, in a beautiful green meadow.

The market is plentifully supplied with provisions, excellent fish, vegetables, and fruit; flowers, too, are exposed for sale, which always embellish a market, as well as every other place where they are found. The inhabitants of Caen appear to be fond of flowers, for pots of carnations were placed in almost every window in the town, and it is hardly possible to imagine what an agreeable effect they produced. The windows are large, and opening inward like folding doors, leave no glass visible on the outside; and most of them being open in every story, and the houses very high, these great square gaps in the walls, for such they seem to the eye of a stranger, would have had a very desolate, comfortless appearance, but for the beautiful carnations that half filled them. The gardeners boasted of the perfection of their ranunculuses and anemonies, but they were out of bloom, and I saw no flowers, except the carnations, that possessed any great merit.

Our apartments at the Hotel de la Place Royale consisted of one handsome well-furnished bed-room, and two small ones; for which we paid six francs a day. Dinner was served at four francs each person. The windows of our chamber looked into the square, and I was awaked every morning at four o'clock by a concourse of labourers of both sexes, assembling there to be hired for harvest work. Many of them waited till the eleventh hour, for the weather was not propitious for their employ, being cold and rainy. The scythes they use are very light, with a little cradle attached, to catch the hay or corn as they mow; and their pitchforks are only forked sticks.

A very extensive manufactory of lace, both of silk and thread, is carried on at Caen. The women sit at work in the streets in groupes of five or six together, with their little pillows on their knees.

The shops, for every sort of merchandize, are reckoned good, and are mostly open to the street, which gives the appearance of a fair. The number of inhabitants is estimated at 30,000.

Had Mrs. Carey suspended her notice of Caen till she had seen more of France, and thus corrected her diary by her experience, she would have perceived and intimated a few of those characteristic differences which render it unlike almost every other French town. First, the streets are wide, which rarely occurs. Secondly, the houses are throughout built of stone supplied from the neighbouring quarries. Then again, its University throws a shade of gloomy quiet over the place, which can be felt only in a town dedicated in a great measure to education. Blended with these, is the peculiarity of character which it takes from being the seat of the higher courts of law,

—ubi togatum
Æstuat agmen,

in that litigious province; and this is again mixed and modified by its having been chosen for the retreat of those numerous noblesse, so called by French courtesy, but who would have been described by us with the less sounding designation of

country gentlemen. Surely the two *Abbayes*, called the *Abbaye aux hommes*, and the *Abbaye aux dames*, the one founded by William the Conqueror, the other by his consort Matilda, deserved some scrap of mention in the enumeration of the chief objects of curiosity at Caen.

Finding fault, however, is not the prevailing tone of our criticism, and we gladly change the key. Mrs. Carey occasionally writes with good sense and acuteness. Her description of Tours, a city which is a great favourite with English residents, is tolerably accurate, and may be found useful to those who meditate a *sejour* in France. We wish, however, that she had omitted the absurd account of an English criminal trial, which, as she relates it, could never have happened.

‘ The situation of Tours is low, but the town appears to great advantage from the entrance over the bridge into the Rue Royale, which is one of the finest streets in France. The houses are built of white stone, and are large, handsome, and uniform. It is paved with flat stones, and a broad space left on each side for people to walk upon, which is not a common case; for in most places, pedestrians are obliged to keep in the middle of the street, as the edges are subject to receive a variety of articles from the windows above, and are, besides, full of lumber, of mechanics at work, or of children at play.

‘ The streets in the old part of the town are narrow, and the houses high. No magnificent public edifices appear, to impress the mind with an image of ancient grandeur, and yet Tours was the favourite place of residence of several of the kings of France; and the palace of Plessis les Tours, standing in a low situation, at the distance of a quarter of mile from the town, still remains. But far from filling the imagination with ideas of the pomp and circumstance of courts, this house, built with brick, and with small windows, is so very mean and homely in appearance, that one finds some difficulty in believing that it ever could have been the abode of royalty. Louis XI., of wicked memory, spent much of his time in it. During his last illness, the walls were defended with iron spikes, and only one wicket left in the court, to admit those who came to the palace. This single entrance still remains, but the spikes are gone. Louis XI. died in 1481, and gave a proof of his penetration and soundness of judgment, by the choice he made of a regent; he appointed his eldest daughter, Anne, lady of Beaujeu, to that office, under the title of governess. She was a woman of high endowments; and though young, being then only in her twenty-second year, well qualified to discharge the important trust. She governed France, during the minority of her brother, Charles VIII., with a steadiness, vigour, and wisdom, that would have done credit to the ablest of its kings.

‘ In the palace of Plessis Henry III. held his court, when negotiating a treaty with the king of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. The two kings met in the pleasure grounds on the opposite side of the river, about two miles below the bridge, on a knoll shaded with trees, and there the treaty was signed. This favoured knoll is an object of

beauty to the surrounding country, and its summit commands a lovely prospect. To the west the eye traces the course of the Loire as far as the sight can reach ; to the east it rests on a more bounded scene, terminated by the bridge, the town, and the beautiful towers of the cathedral. There are few more elegant specimens of gothic architecture than the cathedral ; and it escaped uninjured from the devastations of the revolutionists, whilst the church of St. Martin fell by their destructive hands. St. Martin was the tutelar saint of Tours, and much honoured throughout the kingdom : his church was the largest in France ; and his shrine was enriched with the offerings of kings and nobles. Louis XI. enclosed it with a railing of silver, which Francis I. contrived, by some means or other, to appropriate to his own use ; substituting, in its stead, one of baser metal. Of the body of this church not one stone is now left upon another : two of its towers remain ; and the distance between them marks the great extent of space the building occupied.

Tours, according to popular tradition, was so named from the great number of towers on the ramparts : the only one remaining stands near the quay, and is that where the young Duc de Guise was confined when his father and uncle were assassinated by the command of Henry III., and from which he made his escape after three years imprisonment.

An old history of Tours mentions, that the town was originally built with twelve gates, in imitation of Jerusalem, as described by St. John in the book of Revelation. In more recent times one of its entrances was called the Gate of Hugo ; and the Calvinists, from always passing through it to their private meetings, which were held in that quarter, obtained the name of Hugonots in the year 1560.

The province of Touraine is highly extolled, and is called by the French themselves the garden of France. Its principal feature of beauty is the Loire ; this great river, which rises in the mountains of the Cevennes, after flowing through the Bourbonnois and the Nivernois, to Orleans, pursues its course to Angers, in a narrow flat valley, bounded on each side by a ridge of low hills, and varying in width from two to five miles, the river approaching sometimes to one ridge and sometimes to the other, as it sweeps along. Formerly, in rainy seasons, its waters spread over the whole of the intervening space ; and near Angers, where the valley widens to a considerable extent, the overflowing of the Loire occasioned great damage to the country, making it a perfect swamp. In the year 809, Louis le Debonnaire, son of Charlemagne, passing through Angers, the inhabitants represented to him the mischief they suffered from these frequent inundations ; and he formed the plan of raising a great dam on the north bank of the river, to keep it within bounds. directed his son Pepin, king of Aquitaine, to send a skilful engineer to overlook the work, and encouraged the inhabitants in the undertaking, by granting them great privileges. It does not, however, appear to have been proceeded in so far as to answer entirely the end proposed, till Henry II., King of England, Comte d'Anjou, undertook its completion. He obliged his troops to labour with the inhabitants, allowed them exemp-

tions from military duties, and other immunities, to stimulate their exertions, and at length finished this great work. In the reign of Philip of Valois the mound was repaired, paved on the top, and formed into a public road, and such it continues to be to this day: it is called Charlemagne's Causeway, though the credit of first projecting it belongs properly to his son Louis.

'The valley is cultivated through its whole length like a garden; rich meadows are interspersed with fields of wheat, French beans, and other products, and intersected with rows of willows. The ridges on each side are covered with vineyards, villages, towns, and single houses; so that the number of habitations which have the general appearance of comfort and prosperity creates a degree of astonishment in the mind of the traveller. No alteration has taken place in the face of the country since the year 1802, when we descended the Loire in a boat from Orleans to Nantes; and I conclude it was, if possible, in a still more flourishing state in the year 1777, from the account given by the Emperor of Germany, Joseph II. (brother of the unfortunate Marie Antoinette), who made a tour through France incognito, taking the title of Count of Falkeinstereu. He said, on his return to Paris, that nothing in his whole journey had struck him so much as the causeway on the bank of the Loire, and the number of towns, churches, villages, religious establishments, noble mansions, and farm houses, which extended on the north border of the Loire, from Tours to Angers, and formed almost a street of nearly ninety miles in length.

'Tours is built in a flat valley on the south border of the Loire, and is secured from its incursions by a mound; but the country behind the town is subject to be flooded by the river Cher, which runs for a considerable way almost parallel with the Loire, at the distance of nearly two miles, and afterwards joins it.' pp. 22—27.

Lyons has been often enough described; but some useful hints as to the principal objects within its limits, may be derived from the following passage.

'There are many remains of Roman architecture in the vicinity of Lyons. In the suburb of St. Irénée, where the original town stood, which was burnt in the reign of Nero, several arches are perfect of an aqueduct, constructed by Anthony to supply the troops of Julius Cæsar with water, from the small river Furens. This aqueduct may be traced by numerous vestiges between four and five leagues; and within a few miles of Lyons a row of several noble arches is still in a state of great preservation. A church is built on the summit of Mont Fourvières, from the ruins of a monument erected by Trajan, called Forum Vetus, and in old French, For Viel, which is now changed into Fourvières. Not far distant is the site of the palace where Germanicus was born. A monastery took its place; and that is now converted into an hospital for lunatics; and the building is so extremely ugly and conspicuous, that it is a blot in the scenery of this delightful hill, which, covered with woods, gardens, chateaux, and

vineyards, the church of Fourvières on its highest point, and the venerable cathedral at its base, forms a border of matchless beauty to the Saône. Several streets lead from the bank of the river to the brow of this hill, but the ascent is very steep and laborious. The view it commands of Lyons, its rivers, and surrounding country, is bounded by the Alps, which appear in the horizon like the white and massive clouds "charged with Jove's thunder."

'We had remarked on our journey a great difference in the temperature of the air after we had left the mountains of Tarare behind us. At Lyons, on Sunday, the 29th of September, the heat was so oppressive, that we did not venture to walk out in the middle of the day; but it did not prevent the natives from enjoying their usual promenade. Our windows opened to a street, leading from the Bellecour to the bridge over the Rhone, and we were amused by observing the crowd passing that way to their favourite walk, the Broteaux, on the other side of the river. The street was thronged most part of the day. In the evening, when others were beginning to return, we set out; some were still going, and we soon found ourselves in the midst of the concourse, with just convenient space to walk in, for there was no confusion or jostling; and we proceeded a mile without room to stir to the right or to the left, when finding that we had not reached the place of rendezvous, we turned back, with the same allowance of space to the end of our walk. We halted on the centre of the bridge, to take a view of the myriads of people who filled the road each way as far as we could see, and who appeared to have left their cares at home; for they all looked cheerful, and were decently dressed. We went a day or two afterwards, to ascertain what attractions the Broteaux possessed, and found, besides walks between rows of trees, a number of little public gardens, with seats and bowers, where refreshments of fruit and lemonade might be purchased. The trees bestow but a scanty shade, as they have been planted since the Revolution, when the ancient wood was cut down. Here and there one giant tree escaped the general massacre, and remains, a noble specimen of the shade-giving phalanx which perished by its side. The nearest way from the town is over a very handsome wooden bridge, Pont Morand; but a toll of a sou is demanded of every passenger; so that the Sunday throng prefer going round by the stone bridge near the Bellecour.

'The famous Roman shield, curiously ornamented with figures, representing part of the history of Scipio, was found under one of the arches of this bridge, by some fishermen, who accidentally discovered it in the sand. It was given to Louis XIV., and is now deposited in the Museum of the Botanic Garden at Paris.

'Besides a stand of very excellent hackney coaches at Lyons, a number of other carriages, called carrioles, constantly ply in the streets. They are nearly as large as a coach, and within have a sort of platform, round which the company sit; some looking out of the windows before, some out of the large door cases on each side, having their feet supported in a basket fastened on the outside of the carriole. Though these carriages will hold five or six persons, they are gene-

rally drawn by one horse, and are often driven by women. The women here not only fill the situation of *coachmen*, but likewise that of *boatmen*. All the pleasure boats on the Saône are under their management. This branch of trade is, I believe, secured to them by charter; at all events, they are in possession of it by custom. These boat-women sit in groupes at needle-work on the quay, to be ready when called. One day, on our inquiring for a boat to convey us to l'Isle Barbe, five or six of them jumped up in a moment to offer their services. A gentleman of our party fixed on a very handsome woman, who demanded three francs, ten sous for the fare; and he whispered her that he gave her ten sous more than the others had asked, because she was so much prettier than the rest. He maintained afterwards, that she was better pleased with the compliment than with the money: but I believe the woman had more wit in this instance than he gave her credit for. She rowed us with skill and dexterity about two miles up the river to this celebrated island. It is mentioned in Guillon's "*Tableau de Lyon*," that Charlemagne was so delighted with its beauty when he visited an abbey there, that he conceived the scheme of retiring from the world to this charming spot; and was so determined to put his plan in execution, (which however he never did,) that he collected an excellent library for his own use, which, as well as the abbey itself, was burnt by the Calvinists in the year 1562.' pp. 69—72.

The sex and matron-like character of Mrs. Carey must give authority to her remarks on female education, which we subjoin.

'The French have been in a great dilemma in regard to the education of their daughters, since the abolition of convents. The schools which have been established in their stead possess none of their advantages. In convents children were instructed, not by "persons hired with an insignificant salary, with which necessity alone could compel them to be contented, but by ladies who were adorned with all the accomplishments to which they were to form their pupils, and who devoted themselves to the education of youth from the purest and noblest of motives—motives of religion; considering themselves as answerable to God for the negligence which might endanger either the health or morals of the children entrusted to their care, and the children seeing in their mistresses persons their equals, and sometimes greatly their superiors in birth, were grateful for the marks of affection and interest they received from them, and beholding them invested with a sacred character, paid more attention to the lessons they gave, listening with a sort of religious respect."

'But in my opinion, the greatest advantage that belonged to a convent, as a place of education, was its perfect security from all intrusion, and the general protection which its walls afforded from the nature of the institution; so that children, safe within its precincts, enjoyed more individual liberty, and were less watched and guarded

than in schools, where (in England) they are scarcely ever left to themselves; but live in a state of constant restraint, with their minds perpetually directed to the practice of the great duties—of holding up their heads, turning out their toes, sitting upright on their chairs, and fifty other matters of like importance; which are totally subversive of all natural ease, infantine gayety, and the dear heedless freedom and sportive activity of childhood. It is melancholy to think on the prison-like confinement in which the daughters of our land are doomed to consume the rosy morning of their life; confinement so irksome and unnatural to youth, and so destructive to health of body and health of mind. The eternal attention to appearance, likewise, is mortifying to the dignity of human nature, and can never surely be essential to the education of a rational being.

* Schools for girls should have a large play-ground well guarded and fenced; and then, except in the hours appointed for instruction, they should be left at full liberty to amuse themselves, and to the exercise, so conducive to health, of childish gambols, and innocent frolics, without any watching or interference whatever.

* School girls should never be permitted to walk in procession in the streets, or public roads, to make a display of themselves or of their finery; neither should they have school balls, or exhibitions of any kind: it will be time enough when they are introduced into the world of fashion, to encourage vanity. Whilst at school they ought to dress in a very plain and simple manner, and nearly alike, that there might be no envy or rivalry on that account, and that no unnecessary fears of soiling or tearing their clothes might occupy their thoughts. One great point in their education should be, to encourage cheerfulness and good temper, and to render them civil, obliging, kind, and attentive to one another; which would probably have a more beneficial influence on their future conduct than standing in the stocks one half of their time, and swinging dumb-bells the other.

* With respect to the education of daughters *entirely* at home, one great disadvantage attends it: shut up with a governess they grow listless and melancholy, and seeing themselves objects of so much particular care, attention, and solicitude, they are apt to acquire an overweening opinion of their own importance, and are in danger of becoming proud, reserved, and selfish; but these consequences, though resulting from some defects in the system, do not so necessarily ensue, but they might be prevented. To guard against these defects is the great business of a mother. Indeed, in general, it is wiser for individuals to avoid the errors of an established system, than to undertake the hazardous task of inventing a new one, especially when the experiment must be tried on the minds of youth. Any apparent singularity in their mode of education, tends to engender in the pupils a degree of self-love which prompts them to value themselves too highly if they excel others, and to feel too acutely the mortification of inferiority.

* It behoves a mother to be very circumspect in her choice of a school, or in her choice of a governess. Every little miss, the mo-

ment she quits the nursery, thinks herself justified in becoming a candidate for the office of the latter; but girls should assist in large families under others better qualified for the charge, and gain some information, experience, and judgment, before they presume to undertake the important and arduous task of educating youth.

‘ After good principles, and good sense, the next most material consideration in the choice of a governess is, that she should be a gentlewoman. The manners, the delicacy, the quick sense of propriety, the thousand undefinable minutiae, that constitute the essence of the character, are early and imperceptibly imbibed by almost unconscious imitation. They are not to be taught by a set of rules, or any artificial means, and cannot be imparted by one who has them not herself.

‘ I have frequently been surprised, that ladies who did not suffer their children to interchange a syllable with a servant, lest they should catch a provincial accent, would yet entrust them to the tuition of a governess whose birth, connexions, early habits, and mode of thinking, were vulgar; as if the possession of a few accomplishments would sanctify the rest; or that children were less likely to copy the errors of those to whom they look up for instruction, than of their attendants, whom they quickly learn to regard as their inferiors.

‘ But something of infatuation appears to prevail on this subject: for I have known very sensible parents commit the education of their daughters to girls, almost as young, as thoughtless, and as ignorant as the babies themselves.

‘ The admission into gentlemens’ families, of governesses, who have no pretensions by birth to the rank of gentlewomen, besides its being objectionable on their pupil’s account, is attended by other evils. It is prejudicial to the *profession* of governess: for, by introducing into its pale those who have no other title to gentility, it helps to degrade and sink it in public estimation. The profession is one in which a woman may engage without losing the station of a gentlewoman; but it has not in itself the power to raise those to the rank, who have no claim of their own. By filling up the situation with a description of persons who might be employed, without suffering any degradation, with greater advantage to themselves and to the public, in useful trades or behind a counter, a great number of the portionless daughters of gentlemen are excluded from the means of obtaining their maintenance in the only line they can pursue, without entirely forfeiting their previous rank in society; and it is detrimental to the community at large, by holding out encouragement, or at least affording a pretext for the introduction of a spurious, factitious, and most injurious refinement amongst the inmates of our very cottages. A friend of mine happening to hear music, as she was paying a bill in a butcher’s shop, in a village in Derbyshire, inquired from whence the sound came. The butcher’s wife informed her, that her daughter was learning to play on the *pyhena* in a room behind the shop. The lady took the liberty of remonstrating with her on the folly of letting a girl who must earn her own livelihood, waste money

and time in acquiring so useless an accomplishment. The woman replied, that her husband could give his daughter a pretty fortune—a couple of hundred pounds; and he meant to finish her education at a boarding-school, that she might be *polished up* for a governess, which would put her in a genteeler line of life. Her neighbour, the blacksmith, had sent his daughter to London, to an academy established for the purpose of polishing up girls for governesses; and she was now at my Lord Somebody's, educating the young ladies. "But if your daughter should not be so fortunate as to obtain a situation in a Lord Somebody's family, what will become of her then?" Learning was no burden: she would have got an education, and education was every thing. "A *proper* education," replied my friend, with an emphasis on the word "proper;" which gave great umbrage to the delicate sensibilities of the butcher's wife.' pp. 366—71.

We wish that our fair Traveller had omitted her very indifferent verses, entitled 'Emma.' Great allowance is indeed claimable for what are called *vers de société*; but when they are printed, the compact is broken, in virtue of which those compositions are alone entitled to indulgence. It may be allowed them occasionally to take a little fresh air out of the *escrutoire* or the portfolio, and to be shewn to a few select and partial friends; but they ought not to challenge the public eye.—We must now take leave of Mrs. Carey, not without remarking that any warm commendations bestowed upon her volume, would be a gross flattery, which her own good sense would quickly teach her to despise. Yet, it is not upon the whole disagreeably written, and to travellers who wish to pursue the same route, viz.; that of Cherbourg, Tours, Lyons, Avignon, Marseilles, Montpellier, Bourdeaux, Rochelle, to Tours again, thence to Clermont, Lyons, and then from Geneva to Paris, it may prove a serviceable itinerary.

Art. IV. *Dissertations introductory to the Study and right Understanding of the Language, Structure, and Contents of the Apocalypse.*
By Alexander Tilloch, L.L.D. 8vo. pp. 380. Price 12s. Lond. 1824.

THIS volume was designed by the Author as the precursor of a larger work which he was preparing for the elucidation of the *Apocalypse*, when the seal of death was put upon his multifarious labours. It contains a description of certain peculiarities in the composition of that Book, the nature of which he supposed that he had discovered. There is much ingenuity displayed in these pages, and many remarks occur in them, that are deserving of consideration; but we regret to be obliged to add, that the learned Author has frequently

ventured assertions wholly gratuitous, in order to support a favourite hypothesis, to which he had obviously determined that every fact should be made to bend; and that he has conducted many of the discussions in the volume before us, in a manner that must be pronounced by every impartial reader, not only unfair, but, in some instances, disingenuous. There is a petulance of manner too, discovered towards Dean Woodhouse, (whose work on the Apocalypse is written in a truly excellent spirit,) which, were the Author yet among the living, would have called for rebuke. 'Changes of this kind,' says the Dean, referring to the charges described in the Epistles to the Seven Churches, 'in a whole body of Christians, must be gradual, and the production of many years.' On this unexceptionable statement of an opinion which its Author deemed both correct and important, Dr. Tilloch, in his first Dissertation, animadvert in language as much at variance with good taste as with justice.

'The charge, to suit Mr. Woodhouse's argument, must be one that would require "many years," and therefore the whole body of the believers in Asia must be calumniated.—"Many years!" How many would this writer think sufficient for the establishment of Christianity in the world?' p. 31.

We have represented Dr. Tilloch as sometimes adopting unfair methods in the discussions which he has prosecuted:—we must substantiate that representation by the following example. The testimony of Irenæus, which assigns the date of the publication of the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian, near the close of the first century, has been generally received. Dr. Tilloch is of opinion, that the Apocalypse was written before any other book of the New Testament, so early as the time of Claudius, or, at all events, not later than the reign of Nero. To his arguments in support of that opinion, the critical reader will feel bound to give the requisite attention; but, in the course pursued by Dr. T., he will detect any thing but fair proceeding. At p. 4., Lardner is represented as 'taking it for granted, that John had been banished;' and Dr. Tilloch asks, (p. 12.) 'Could John by no possibility have visited Patmos, "for the word of God," or to preach the gospel, till after he had taken up his residence at Ephesus?' At p. 15., referring to the argument for a late date of the Apocalypse, which some writers have founded on the fact, that no traces are to be discovered of any persecution of the Christians in the reign of Claudius, the Author remarks:—

'This argument assumes, as not to be questioned, that John's visit to Patmos was by compulsion, in consequence of persecution; but he

himself does not say so ; he only states that he was there, *δια του λογον του θιου*, "for the word of God"—words which, taken in their strict and proper sense, do not convey that idea ; and shall we be content, on a question of this kind, to receive the traditions of men who would have us believe, without giving their authority, that John was cast, by order of Nero or Domitian, into a vessel of boiling oil, and came out unhurt ?

Now, in the first place, Irenæus has not a single word about the vessel of boiling oil ; his testimony, therefore, may be received, without subjecting us to the imputation of believing on no authority. Secondly, the phrase 'for the word of God,' *δια του λογον του θιου*, is never used as denoting 'to preach the gospel.' In direct opposition to Dr. T., we take upon us to affirm, that John's own testimony is substantially in favour of the opinion that he was in the Island of Patmos by compulsion, in consequence of persecution. But why has the passage in question been exhibited by Dr. Tilloch in a mutilated form ? It reads as follows in the *Apocalypse* :—"I, John, who also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." These expressions, we apprehend, by no means convey the notion that John had gone voluntarily to Patmos, for the purpose of preaching the gospel. It is to a state of suffering, and not to circumstances of voluntary service, that they clearly point. In other instances in which these or similar phrases are employed in the *Apocalypse*, they unquestionably imply persecution and suffering. *Ex. gr.* "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." (Chap. vi. 9.)—"the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God." (Chap. xx. 4.) Let the words which the Author has so strangely omitted in the preceding extract, be supplied to complete the quotation, and then let the entire passage be compared with the above sentences, and the conclusion, we think, must be, that it affords the clearest and strongest evidence in support of the concurrent testimony of the early writers, that John, as a persecuted Apostle, was banished to Patmos. We shall subjoin a passage from Origen, to shew in what sense he understood the words of John, which Dr. Tilloch has so strangely treated. 'And a Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, banished John into the island Patmos, for the testimony which he bore to the word of truth. And John himself bears witness to his banishment, omitting the name of the emperor by whom he was banished, saying in the Revelation : *I, John, who also am*

*'your companion and brother in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle of Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. And it seems that the Revelation was seen in that island.'**

We assume then, as a conclusion established by satisfactory proof, that John was in Patmos as a confessor and as a persecuted Apostle. And we deem it probable, that to the banishment of John a later date is to be assigned, than would be required by the supposition that the *Apocalypse* was the first written of all the books of the New Testament. In the year 51 of the Christian era, Claudius ordered the removal of the Jews from Rome. Admitting that Christians were included in that proscription, it very satisfactorily appears from the account given in the eighteenth chapter of the Acts, that no molestation was directed against them in other parts of the empire. The first general persecution of the Christians was in the tenth year of Nero's reign, A.D. 64; and before that period, it may be presumed, from a comparison of passages in the Acts of the Apostles, with some of the Apostolic writings, that Paul had written some of his epistles. But, if there was no persecution of the Christians which could expose them to banishment in the Roman provinces before the tenth year of Nero's reign, and if, before that time, the Apostle Paul had written some of his epistles, the Revelation of John, which was disclosed to him in his exile, could not have been the first written of the books of the New Testament. The testimony of Irenæus refers the date of the *Apocalypse* to a time of great and general persecution; and as his testimony has been generally received, so, it appears entitled to credit from the manner in which it is given; and it is the testimony of a writer who lived two hundred years before Epiphanius, and four hundred years before Arethas, whose accounts Dr. Tilloch is disposed to receive. The Revelation *'was seen not long ago, but almost in our own age, near the end of the reign of Domitian:—such is the account given by Irenæus.*

We shall now extract a passage of some length, for the purpose of shewing the manner in which Dr. Tilloch proceeds with the argument which has been urged in favour of a late date of the *Apocalypse*, from the representation contained in the addresses to the several Asiatic churches, descriptive of their state.

* Origen in Matt. xx. 23. Quoted by Lardner, Supplement to Cred. ch. 9. Works, Vol. VI. p. 174. Kippis's Ed.

That the Asiatic churches could not, so early as the reign of Nero, exhibit the character ascribed to them in the Apocalypse, is a mere assumption; for we have seen that other churches were equally censurable, at the time at which the different epistles, addressed to them, were written. Let us apply the same mode of enquiry into character, to the Asiatic churches, by examining the only Apostolic Epistle which we have, addressed to one of the Apocalyptic churches: I mean that sent to the saints at Ephesus.

Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. iii. 17, 19), prays that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith, that, being **ROOTED AND GROUNDED IN LOVE**, they might know the love of Christ, which excelleth knowledge of any other kind. The Apostle was ever earnest, in his prayers, that all the churches might increase and abound in love yet more and more; but in his subsequent exhortation he more than insinuates a reason for his particular anxiety, on this point, respecting the Ephesians — “*I the prisoner of the Lord beseech you to walk worthy of your calling, with all lowliness and meekness, with LONG SUFFERING, FORBEARING (or bearing with) ONE ANOTHER IN LOVE; earnestly endeavouring to PRESERVE THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE—one body and one spirit*” (iv. 1—4). Does he not here plainly intimate, that they were now exhibiting a temper and conduct very different from that spirit of love by which Christians ought to be characterised? He goes on, in the fourth chapter, to remind them of the design of all CHRIST’S gifts to the church, namely, the edification and perfecting of the body of CHRIST, “*that we may no longer be children, tossed like waves, and carried about by every wind of doctrine,...but speaking the truth IN LOVE may grow up into CHRIST the head.....This I say therefore and charge you in the Lord, that ye NO LONGER walk as other gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind.....Put away lying, and speak every man truth to his neighbour; for we are members one of another. ARE YE ANGRY! AND WITHOUT SIN? [impossible]. Let not the sun go down upon your wrath, nor [thus by your anger] give place to the devil.....Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth...and grieve not THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD.....Let all BITTERNESS, and WRATH, and ANGER, and CLAMOR, and EVIL SPEAKING, be PUT AWAY FROM YOU, and all MALICE: and BE YE KIND one to another, TENDER HEARTED, FORGIVING one another, even as God for CHRIST’S sake hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore imitators of God as dear children, and WALK IN LOVE as CHRIST hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.*” (iv. 5).

A departure from their “**FIRST LOVE**” is plainly inferable from the whole of this exhortation; nor can we longer doubt, that such a change in the conduct of some of the members of this church, as Mr. Woodhouse, and those whom he follows, maintain could not possibly take place before the reign of Domitian, had actually occurred before the date of this Epistle (A.D. 61 according to the best critics); and, so far, their argument for a late date to the Apocalypse is unfounded. That they should have entirely overlooked the strong

reproofs of the apostle to this church—reproofs which fix upon it the same character ascribed to it in the Apocalypse—is surprising; and it is still more surprising that Mr. Woodhouse should so strenuously maintain, and expand the argument, in the face of this direct testimony of Paul, that this church had actually *turned from her first love*, before he wrote this epistle.

‘The reproof to this church, in the Apocalypse, runs thus:

‘“*I have against thee that THY LOVE [ἀγάπη], THY FIRST [love], THOU HAST LEFT*” [or forsaken]. Rev. ii. 4.

‘Paul, writing to Timothy, says:—

‘“*I besought thee to abide at Ephesus that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine. Now the end [or design] of this charge is LOVE [ἀγάπη], out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; FROM WHICH SOME HAVING SWERVED, HAVE TURNED ASIDE TO VAIN JANG-LING.*” 1 Tim i. 5.

‘From this it appears not only possible, that the church at Ephesus could *depart from her first love*, so early as the time of Nero, but most certain that this church had actually then *swerved from it and turned aside*. The whole argument, therefore, for a late date for the Apocalypse, drawn from the alleged state of the churches when the Revelation was written, falls to the ground; for here we have a church—one of the seven Apocalyptic churches too—reproved for the very fault laid to her charge in the Apocalypse, and that more than thirty years before the date which those who ascribe the book to the reign of Domitian would give to this prophecy.’ pp. 33—37.

Now, in the whole of these quotations, and they are in some instances improperly detached from the connexion in which the Apostle has placed them, what is there, we would ask, of direct charge or censure? What faults are reprehended? What reproofs are administered? Is there any article of counsel or exhortation which would not be strictly proper and necessary in addressing Gentile converts on their first admission into the church, or on their being formed into a Christian community? And if the whole of these passages are appropriate to such a state, and to Christians in such circumstances, what evidence do they afford of declension? But would not the whole of those exhortations be in place in an epistle to a Christian community of the most exemplary character and conduct? If, then, to churches of the greatest celebrity for purity and consistency, such counsels and exhortations would not be unnecessary, what proof or presumption do they furnish of their being in a declining condition? But we would direct the particular attention of our readers to the compared passages, Rev. ii. 4, and 1 Tim. i. 5, in the preceding extract, on which Dr. Tilloch has founded the bold assertion, that the church of Ephesus had most certainly departed from her first

love,—had, so early as the time of the date of the first Epistle to Timothy, actually swerved from it and turned aside. They will notice the extraordinary manner in which Dr. T. has connected the relative 'FROM WHICH' with the noun 'LOVE' as its antecedent. But neither is the relative singular, nor is the noun 'love' the antecedent. The relative is plural, 'Ω', and refers to the three immediately preceding nouns;—'from which,' namely, '*a pure heart, a good conscience, and unfeigned faith.*' Who, unless he had an hypothesis to maintain to which every propriety of interpretation must be sacrificed, could find, in this passage, 'the church at Ephesus reprov'd for the very fault laid to her charge in the Apocalypse?' There is no fault laid to the charge of the church at Ephesus, in the quotation from the Epistle to Timothy, which Dr. Tilloch has shaped to his own purpose. Who were the '*some*' that had swerved? If Dr. Tilloch had done justice to his quotation, he would have proceeded a little further, and added the words, "desiring to be teachers of the law," which make it plain who the '*some*' were: they were persons who intruded themselves into the churches for the purpose of corrupting the doctrines received by them, and who set themselves up as instructors, in opposition to the Apostles and other genuine Christian teachers;—they sought to pervert the disciples, and were men of corrupt minds. (chap. vi. 5.) These were the persons who had swerved; they every where infested the churches; and Timothy had a charge given him by the Apostle, to guard the Christians at Ephesus against their innovations. But against the Ephesian church itself, there is no allegation in his Epistle.

The facility with which a writer can adopt unsubstantial data, and apply them to the support of an hypothesis, is strikingly illustrated in the following sentence.

'Cerinthus, who wrote a false Apocalypse, borrowing, altering, and corrupting passages from the genuine one, having died before John, it is impossible that John's Apocalypse could have been written so late as the time of the persecution by Domitian.' pp. 42, 3.

The whole of these particulars are too remote from certainty to be the basis of substantial argument. The time of Cerinthus is not accurately to be determined; there is no proof that he died before John. It is not to be ascertained, that he wrote a false Apocalypse; nor is it a position which it would be safe to maintain, that he borrowed, altered, and corrupted passages from the genuine one. Lardner thought it highly probable, that Cerinthus flourished in the latter end of the first, or very early in the second century, and that there is not any good ground to conclude, that he corrupted and interpolated

the genuine Revelation of St. John. See Lardner, (Kippis's Ed.) Vol. IX. p. 330. Vol. III. p. 116. Lardner's discussions may not be on all points conducted to satisfactory conclusions, but they may very confidently be pleaded against the sweeping impossibility which Dr. Tilloch has founded upon assumptions of a very questionable character.

The date of the *Apocalypse* may seem to some readers to be a point of but little moment; but, if Dr. Tilloch's notion of its design be a correct one, it cannot be accounted a superfluous labour, to ascertain by all available means the time of its publication.

'— For, being,' he says, ' a direct revelation from the Head of the Church, if written in the reign of Claudius, or early in that of his successor Nero, it must be considered as having been given for the instruction of the apostles themselves, as well as of the other members of Christ's body; and, if so, it must have been often the subject of their meditations; and not unfrequently, its topics would furnish matter for allusion in their oral addresses, and, most probably, also in their epistles to the churches.'

This we believe to be quite a new view of the *Apocalypse*. If, however, this book were designed for the use of the Apostles, it would seem not a little singular, that they should never in their epistles make direct mention of so important a document; that, instead of being addressed and sent to them, it should have been addressed and forwarded to the seven Asiatic churches; and that John, the writer of it, should not have either named or referred to the Apostles, or stated its design. The Apostle Paul, from whom proceeded the greater part of the Epistles in the New Testament, has strongly asserted the original and independent character of his qualifications as an Apostle and Christian teacher; and he furnishes no ground of surmise, either to his opponents, or to his adherents, of any other source from which his instructions were received, than the communications made to him directly and personally by the great Head of the Church. The supposition of such a design and use of the *Apocalypse* as the preceding extract exhibits, is not recommended by the slightest degree of probability. Dr. Tilloch, however, takes some pains to obtain credit for this romantic hypothesis; and he proceeds, in his second Dissertation,—' On the evidence furnished by the Epistles in the New Testament, respecting the time when the *Apocalypse* was written,'—to shew that the writers of the epistles had before them the *Apocalypse*, or were acquainted with it, and either copied from it, or have alluded to it. Of Dr. Tilloch's researches and conclusions in this part of his argument, we shall furnish a few

examples : we begin with the first passages on which he comments.

‘ In ch. x. 35, 36. (of the Epistle to the Hebrews) he exhorts them to retain *their confidence, which hath great recompence of REWARD*, having need of patience, that, after doing the will of GOD, they “*might receive THE PROMISE.*” That *the promise* refers to *the inheritance* promised by CHRIST, in the Apocalypse, is plain, from what he adds in v. 37, “*For in a very little while* *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* THE COMING ONE “*will come ; yea he will not procrastinate.*”—“*The coming one*” was a name applied to the MESSIAH before he appeared on the earth, and is the term employed in Matt. xi. 3. “*Art Thou the coming one?*” (Common Version, *he that should come*). But the Jews had lost all knowledge of the fact that he was to come *twice* : nor did even his disciples understand this, till after his ascension. That is, according to their belief, this appellation must have ceased to be any longer applicable to him, after he had once appeared on the earth. But it is again appropriated to him in the Apocalypse, in reference to his *second coming*. He is there called, *ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἔν, ΚΑΙ Ὁ ἔΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ*, and THE COMING ONE, (Common Version, “*him which is to come*”) Rev. i. 4. iv. 8.; and it is from this second appropriation of this name that Paul employs it, in reference to *the promise* which will be performed when the MESSIAH comes again, to receive his people to himself. In one word, “*The coming one*” is *the Alpha and the Omega of the Revelation*, who says, “*Behold I come QUICKLY, and my REWARD is with me ;*” (Rev. xxii. 12.) “*I AM ὁ ἐρχόμενος, THE COMING ONE.*” (Rev. i. 8.)’ pp. 52—54.

In Dissertation the Fifth, Dr. Tilloch informs us, that ‘ these words then—*ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἔν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*—are no part of those ‘ spoken by HIM who says, in the first clause of the verse, *Εγὼ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω*, I am the Alpha and the Omega ; but are ‘ explanatory terms, added by the writer.’ This appears to us directly to contradict the concluding part of the preceding extract. Again : Dr. Tilloch refers the expressions, “*Behold I come quickly,*” to the second coming of Christ ;” whereas in Dissertation the second, (p. 3.) he appears to adopt from Michaelis the opinion that they refer to the destruction of Jerusalem. Michaelis refers Heb. x. 37, to the destruction of Jerusalem ; so does Macknight. But, admitting that this passage refers to the second and final coming of Christ, we see no proof whatever, from the comparison of passages brought forward by the Author, that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews copied from the Apocalypse. If ‘ the coming one’ is a name applied to the Messiah in reference to his appearance in the world, it is an expression which the discourses of our Lord would teach his disciples to appropriate to him in respect to a future advent. Dr. Tilloch allows, that, after Christ’s ascen-

sion, his disciples understood the fact, that he was to come twice. The disciples were informed very particularly of this fact. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 11.) This assurance of the fact must have been current among the disciples and among all Christians; and the appellation would not therefore cease either to be applicable to him, or to be used in such application. If there had been no Revelation written, the appellation would still have been suggested, and might unquestionably have been employed by a writer who had never seen or heard of the *Apocalypse*. With respect to 'the promise,' we might satisfy ourselves with asking, whether it remained unknown till the publication of the *Apocalypse*, that there is a reward for the righteous; and whether an inspired writer had any occasion to have that book in his possession, before he could exhort believers in the Gospel to expect the fulfilment of the promise of God to complete the felicity of the pious?

Again, take the following passage.

'The first Epistle to the Corinthians, supposed by Critics to have been written in the year 56 or 57, exhibits, in the 15th Chapter, an evidence of its posteriority to the *Apocalypse*, so conclusive, that it must appear, when pointed out, very surprising that Critics could possibly have missed the sense of the Apostle.

'In the *Apocalypse* the future time is divided into periods marked out by *Trumpets*, under the sounding of each of which, respectively, certain events are predicted. In Ch. x. 6, 7 we are taught that *time shall continue only to the days of the voice of the seventh Angel*, or the last of these seven trumpets: and, in Ch. xi. 15-18, that *when the seventh Angel sounds, then is come the time of the dead that they should be judged; and that the saints shall then be rewarded*. In the 20th Chapter this reward is explained as being connected with a resurrection from the dead: "*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.*"

'Some of the Corinthians had misunderstood, and misapplied, the things thus taught respecting "*the Resurrection*,"—probably taking the expression as something figurative, and saying, "*there is no [real or literal] resurrection.*" The Apostle first corrects their mistaken views, shewing that, *at CHRIST's coming*, the resurrection of believers shall be as true and real as was the resurrection of CHRIST himself, who was "*the first fruits*;" and that, when this shall be, "*then cometh the end*," (as taught in the *Apocalypse*): after stating this he dwells on the subject, answers questions which some might put, respecting the manner of the resurrection, and the body to be given to the dead, and in ver. 51, 52 addresses them thus: "*Behold I show you a secret; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all*

"be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at THE LAST TRUMPET; for the trumpet shall sound; and the dead shall be raised incorruptible: and we shall be changed."

The Apostle, by the manner of his expression, when he introduces the *Trumpet*, shows that, so far as respects it, he was speaking of something with which they were already acquainted; for he not only introduces the term "*last*," but also employs the article—τῇ ἰσχάτι σάλπιγγι, "THE *last trumpet*;" and no trumpet had previously been mentioned in the Epistle. The *mystery* then, or *secret*, of which he speaks, respects, not the trumpet, but the sudden change to be passed on the saints who shall be alive at Christ's second coming. They shall then undergo a change similar to that which the dead have experienced or shall experience, with this difference only, that it shall be, *in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye*. The mention of the trumpet is merely casual, to point out to the Corinthians the period at which this shall take place:—it shall be at THE LAST TRUMPET. Had they not, before, heard of "*the last trumpet*," Paul's reference to it, with the Article, would have been unintelligible: but I shall rather question the judgment of those persons who ascribe barbarisms to the inspired Apostle, than believe that he writes nonsense. The trumpet of which he speaks is THE LAST of the Apocalyptic trumpets; for in the text quoted, we have—"the trumpet"—"the last trumpet"—"the sounding of the last trumpet"—an explanation of a secret respecting an event that is to take place "at the last trumpet." What farther identity would the most obtuse mind require, as demonstrative of the source whence the Apostle draws his argument as to the period of the change of which he speaks? I venture to say more:—Those who can look at such passages and yet question the source, must be but little acquainted with the modes of quotation used by the Apostolical and Evangelical writers.—"The LAST trumpet," is an expression without meaning but as taken in relation to prior trumpets.' pp. 99—102.

The value of such criticism as this it is not difficult to appreciate. In 1 Thess. iv. 16, we have σάλπιγγι θεοῦ without the article, where the reference is not less definite to the closing scene of time, than in the former case. In 1 John ii. 18, we have *last hour*; in Jude, verse 18, *last time*; where the words are without the article, though the reference is definite, and must connect in the writer's mind with a previously understood time, or hour. If, however, a reference be wanted to confirm the definite use of the article in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, it may be made to Matt. xxiv. 31; for, supposing that that gospel was written after the epistle to the Corinthians, the declaration of Christ which it records in relation to his second and final coming, must have been well remembered among his disciples. We perceive in passages like the preceding, no proof that the Apostle referred to a published book, or borrowed from it.

In Dissertation the third, 'On the verbal language of the

sion, his disciples understood the fact, that he was to come twice. The disciples were informed very particularly of this fact. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i. 11.) This assurance of the fact must have been current among the disciples and among all Christians; and the appellation would not therefore cease either to be applicable to him, or to be used in such application. If there had been no Revelation written, the appellation would still have been suggested, and might unquestionably have been employed by a writer who had never seen or heard of the *Apocalypse*. With respect to 'the promise,' we might satisfy ourselves with asking, whether it remained unknown till the publication of the *Apocalypse*, that there is a reward for the righteous; and whether an inspired writer had any occasion to have that book in his possession, before he could exhort believers in the Gospel to expect the fulfilment of the promise of God to complete the felicity of the pious?

Again, take the following passage.

'The first Epistle to the Corinthians, supposed by Critics to have been written in the year 56 or 57, exhibits, in the 15th Chapter, an evidence of its posteriority to the *Apocalypse*, so conclusive, that it must appear, when pointed out, very surprising that Critics could possibly have missed the sense of the Apostle.

'In the *Apocalypse* the future time is divided into periods marked out by *Trumpets*, under the sounding of each of which, respectively, certain events are predicted. In Ch. x. 6, 7 we are taught that *time shall continue only to the days of the voice of the seventh Angel*, or the last of these seven trumpets: and, in Ch. xi. 15-18, that *when the seventh Angel sounds, then is come the time of the dead that they should be judged; and that the saints shall then be rewarded*. In the 20th Chapter this reward is explained as being connected with a resurrection from the dead: "*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.*"

'Some of the Corinthians had misunderstood, and misapplied, the things thus taught respecting "*the Resurrection*,"—probably taking the expression as something figurative, and saying, "*there is no [real or literal] resurrection.*" The Apostle first corrects their mistaken views, shewing that, at CHRIST'S coming, the resurrection of believers shall be as true and real as was the resurrection of CHRIST himself, who was "*the first fruits*;" and that, when this shall be, "*then cometh the end*," (as taught in the *Apocalypse*): after stating this he dwells on the subject, answers questions which some might put, respecting the manner of the resurrection, and the body to be given to the dead, and in ver. 51, 52 addresses them thus: "*Behold I show you a secret; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all*

"be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at THE LAST TRUMPET; for the trumpet shall sound; and the dead shall be raised incorruptible: and we shall be changed."

The Apostle, by the manner of his expression, when he introduces the *Trumpet*, shows that, so far as respects it, he was speaking of something with which they were already acquainted; for he not only introduces the term "*last*," but also employs the article—τῇ ἰσχυάτῃ σάλπιγγι, "*THE last trumpet*;" and no trumpet had previously been mentioned in the Epistle. The *mystery* then, or *secret*, of which he speaks, respects, not the trumpet, but the sudden change to be passed on the saints who shall be alive at Christ's second coming. They shall then undergo a change similar to that which the dead have experienced or shall experience, with this difference only, that it shall be, *in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye*. The mention of the trumpet is merely casual, to point out to the Corinthians the period at which this shall take place:—it shall be at THE LAST TRUMPET. Had they not, before, heard of "*the last trumpet*," Paul's reference to it, with the Article, would have been unintelligible: but I shall rather question the judgment of those persons who ascribe barbarisms to the inspired Apostle, than believe that he writes nonsense. The trumpet of which he speaks is THE LAST of the Apocalyptic trumpets; for in the text quoted, we have—"the trumpet"—"the last trumpet"—"the sounding of the last trumpet"—an explanation of a secret respecting an event that is to take place "*at the last trumpet*." What farther identity would the most obtuse mind require, as demonstrative of the source whence the Apostle draws his argument as to the period of the change of which he speaks? I venture to say more:—Those who can look at such passages and yet question the source, must be but little acquainted with the modes of quotation used by the Apostolical and Evangelical writers.—"The LAST trumpet," is an expression without meaning but as taken in relation to prior trumpets.' pp. 99—102.

The value of such criticism as this it is not difficult to appreciate. In 1 Thess. iv. 16, we have σάλπιγγι Σίου without the article, where the reference is not less definite to the closing scene of time, than in the former case. In 1 John ii. 18, we have *last hour*; in Jude, verse 18, *last time*; where the words are without the article, though the reference is definite, and must connect in the writer's mind with a previously understood time, or hour. If, however, a reference be wanted to confirm the definite use of the article in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, it may be made to Matt. xxiv. 31; for, supposing that that gospel was written after the epistle to the Corinthians, the declaration of Christ which it records in relation to his second and final coming, must have been well remembered among his disciples. We perceive in passages like the preceding, no proof that the Apostle referred to a published book, or borrowed from it.

In Dissertation the third, 'On the verbal language of the

'Apocalypse,' we meet with some ingenious and interesting remarks on the phraseology of this book; but, in many instances, they are more fanciful than just, and in others, they are decidedly erroneous. The words, ὁ μαρτυρὸς ὁ πιστός, Chap. i. 5, are considered as the expression of a Hebrew noun by the Amanuensis of the Apocalypse; and, in Chap. iii. 14, they are regarded as forming no part of the words of the speaker, but as a parenthetical explanation by John himself, defining the meaning of the indeclinable Hebrew noun אָמֵן, Amen. We doubt the correctness of these representations, because we find the same usage in passages where explanation could not be necessary to Greek readers, for whose benefit those parenthetical explanations are supposed to be inserted. Thus, in Chap. i. 8, we have "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord." In Chap. xxii. 13, we have "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last." The latter words, in both instances, are inserted, not as explanatory of Alpha and Omega, but for the purpose of emphasis, and they are evidently the words of the speaker. The strong assertions of the following passage we shall prove to be erroneous.

'In the use of the prepositions John is so rigid that unless a translator attends to them with great care, noting the case with which they are put in construction, he will often fail to express the sense of the original. In no point have translators failed more essentially than in this: giving a kind of school-boy version, which, in many instances, conjures up a false picture to the mind. Take the following as an instance: Εἶδον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον (ch. v. 1.) Here the first ἐπὶ is joined with an accusative, in which situation it never, in any instance, expresses position *on* or *in* place,—any thing resting *in situ*: yet all the versions have rendered these words thus: "I saw *IN* the right hand of him that sat *on* the throne a book." Now the fact is—John did not see, nor does he say that he saw, a book in any hand whatever, either right or left. Had he meant to say so, he would, when employing the preposition ἐπὶ, have put the noun in the genitive. He tells us that he saw a book *on* or *concerning* a certain subject or topic; and informs us what this subject was; namely, "*the right hand of the one sitting upon the throne.*" Consequently "*the right hand*" must not be taken in its proper sense, but in some other to which the Scripture is not a stranger. In one word, a little enquiry will satisfy the reader, that he here employs the expression commonly used in the Old Testament for *power*:—he saw a treatise or work which had for its principal topic, *the POWER of the one sitting upon the throne.* In fact, the text presents a strong Hebrew figure of speech, which escapes entirely the notice of the reader, when the preposition is wrongly translated." pp. 158, 9.

Now to the assertion that ἐπὶ with an accusative never, in

any instance, expresses position *on* or *in* place,—any thing resting *in situ*, we shall oppose decided examples of this very usage; and both for the sake of avoiding a discussion which might be tedious to our readers, and for the purpose of establishing the position which is thus peremptorily stated to be a false one, by the very authority to which Dr. Tilloch limits his observations, we shall restrict our proofs to the Apocalypse. In Chap. iv. 4, we have ἐπὶ τοῖς θρόνοις ἑκοσὶ τέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους, καθήμενους, *upon the thrones four and twenty elders sitting*. Chap. xiv. 1, we cite, τὸ ῥόνιον ἱστῆκός ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σιών, *the Lamb standing on the mount Sion*. In Chap. xix. 11, we find ἵππος λευκός, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ’ αὐτόν, *a white horse, and he that sat upon him*; verse 12, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ διαδήματα, *and upon his head many crowns*; verse 16, ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ ὄνομα γεγραμμένον, *upon his vesture and upon his thigh a name inscribed*. In these quotations, and we could increase their number, the preposition is joined with accusatives, and undeniably expresses, in every one of the examples, position *on* or *in* place. The elders were seen seated *on* thrones; the Lamb was seen standing *on* mount Sion; the rider was seated *on* the white horse; the crowns were posited *on* the rider’s head; the letters of the inscription were engraven *on* his vesture and *on* his thigh. These are all instances in which the preposition ἐπὶ is applied to nouns which denote objects resting *in situ*, and they are more than sufficient to prove the error and rashness of the Author in so peremptorily asserting the contrary of the fact. We read, therefore, “in the right hand,” or, as we suppose the right hand was expanded, and the volume rested upon it, “on the right hand” of the one sitting on the throne.” The strangeness of Dr. Tilloch’s interpretation is too obvious to require refutation. In the seventh verse, the action described is, the taking of the book out of or from off the right hand of the one sitting on the throne. The fact, then, is, that John did see, and that he says he saw, a book in, or on the hand, &c. and Dr. Tilloch’s criticism is altogether futile.

Equally unsubstantial are his explanations of verse 6th, the sense of which he entirely mistakes. He strangely denies that ἱστῆκος can have any thing to do with *standing* as opposed to sitting, or any reference whatever to *posture*. To any sober critic the word would convey the notion of standing, and of nothing else. What but standing is the meaning of ἱστῆκώς, Gen. xviii, 22? Abraham was standing before the Lord. So, in 1 Kings x. 19, ἱστῆκοις refers to posture, *standing*. So Dan. viii. 3, ἱστῆκώς, a ram was *standing*. And not to multiply examples, what but *standing* is the meaning of ἱστῆκος in this very book, Rev. xiv. 1, “I saw a Lamb standing on the mount Sion.”

Dr. Tilloch too very strangely apprehends that the phrase *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου* is to be understood as denoting place upon the throne: 'the individual who is represented as filling, occupying, or SITTING UPON the throne,—as being in the midst of the throne; and this one is the Lamb.' The absurdity of this interpretation will be instantly perceived when the passage is brought under the notice of the most superficial reader; for, in the same manner in which the Lamb was in the midst of the throne, he was in the midst of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders. The Lamb was in the middle space between the throne and the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, and was *standing*. It cannot be necessary to proceed with the consideration of such criticisms as these, though the Author is so much delighted with them, and regards them as so important, as to exhibit them again in several subsequent pages.

In the Fourth Dissertation, the Author considers the various names by which the Creator of the Universe is designated in the Scriptures, and the proper mode of translating them. He discusses at some length the usage of the sacred writers in respect to the attributive nouns *אל* El, *אלה*, or *אלוה*, Eloah, and *אלהים*, Elohim, commonly rendered 'God' in the English public version of the Scriptures. David Levi, in his "*Lingua Sacra*," explains these several nouns in reference to *power* absolute and unlimited, and asserts the last of them to be singular in number. Dr. Tilloch assigns the same etymological import to the nouns, and contends against the plural interpretation of *אלהים* as applied to the Supreme Being. As the English representative of this noun, he uses the expression 'Omnipotence,' and, in cases in which the *ה* is prefixed, 'The Omnipotent.' In Section the Third of this Dissertation, an explanation is given of the phrase 'image of God,' as used in Gen. i. 26—28, which we cannot pass over. 'The image, likeness, or resemblance,' 'here intended,' says the Author, 'was given to man as the head of the animal creation; the resemblance related to power, the attribute by which JEHOVAH designates himself throughout the whole context.' But was not the dominion which man exercised over the animal creation as its head, an investiture granted to him subsequently to his being created? and does not the Apostle, in Colos. iii. 10, suggest, that the Divine resemblance of the first man to his Creator, consisted in something else than his possessing the attribute of power?

In Dissertation the Fifth, 'On the Hebrew name JEHOVAH [*יהוה*], and the Greek expressions *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ*,' the Author contends that the words used by the writer of the Apocalypse, "*which is, and which was, and which is to come*"—*ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*

ἐρχομενος, are employed by him to define the sense in which he uses the word Κεῖνος, when he employs this Greek word to represent the Hebrew name JEHOVAH; this, Dr. T. regards as a compound of the *past*, the *present*, and the *future time* of the Hebrew verb of existence היה, and proposes the word *Eternal* for adoption as corresponding to the definition given by John. In a subsequent part of his work, (Dissertation the Seventh,) he resumes the subject of definitions, and ventures some opinions which the reader who examines the authorities cited in their support, will not be disposed to adopt. If the expressions which Dr. Tilloch considers as definitions, be really such, it will occur to the reader of his work to inquire, whether they are used in this way in agreement with the practice of writers who define the terms which they introduce into their compositions. When a writer intends to use words which require explanation, it is natural to expect that he would employ both the term which required to be explained and the definition itself, in the first instance of his introducing them. We should not expect him to give us the definition without the term, or the term apart from the definition. But, in Revel. i. v. 4. John uses, in his address to the churches of Asia, the following words; ἀπο τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἦν, καὶ τοῦ ἐρχομενου. And in the following verse, we have, ἀπο Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἀρχὼν τῶν βασιλείων τῆς γῆς. In both cases, these are the words of John. Are the expressions ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, *the faithful and true witness*, a definition of the words which immediately precede them? This will not be imagined. They must then be a description of character applying to the person here named, and cannot in this instance be a definition, not being preceded by a term which requires explanation. ὁ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, are said by Dr. Tilloch to be a definition of the Hebrew בכור (bechor), which the Apostle applies to Jesus Christ as an epithet occurring in Psalm lxxxix, 27, relative to the Messiah, adding the words ‘from the dead.’ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, as explanatory of the sense in which he is called ‘*the first born.*’ But is not the term ‘first born,’ as used in the Hebrew Scriptures, employed in quite another relation than the expression “first born from the dead,” in the New Testament? And is not the whole phrase a descriptive character applied to Jesus Christ by the Apostle, rather than a definition of any term used by him? In Coloss. i. 15, the phrase occurs, “first born of the whole creation,” which may with equal propriety be regarded as a definition given by the writer of the Hebrew word ‘bechor’ in Psalm lxxxix, 27, the words following being added to explain the sense in which he uses it. But, unless “first born of every creature” and “first born from the

"dead," be expressions identical in meaning, we shall have different explanations of the same term by the two inspired Apostles. The Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Colossians, has stated, however, the sense in which he uses the expression "first born," and it is one which excludes the meaning, "from the dead." Again, if "which is, and which was, and which is to come," be words defining the term *Κυριος*, as taking the place of the Hebrew word JEHOVAH, it would be natural to expect the uniform application of them in every case in which *Κυριος* is used; because, if it were the design of the writer in using them, to express time *past*, *present*, and *future*, the omission of any part of the whole series of words, would prevent the proper import of the word defined from being conveyed to the reader. In Chap. xi. 17. we have *Κυριε—ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν* (Griesbach,)

'and here,' says Dr. Tilloch, 'it is remarkable that the whole term *יהוה* seems not to have been employed, but only *יהוה*, the *yod*, the sign of the future, being left out, because the time of Christ's second coming is anticipated, for when he shall have come, he will no longer be *the coming one*, *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*.'

Now this appears to us very much like giving up the position which the Dr. has been at so much pains to maintain; for, if, for any reasons, the part of the combined expressions which denotes '*futuration*,' *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, can be separated from the others which denote time *present* and time *past*, it amounts to a denial of the kind of existence for which the Author has been contending as of necessity implied in the Hebrew JEHOVAH and its Greek equivalent *Κυριος*. The reason assigned by Dr. Tilloch for the omission is, however, not a substantial one; for, in Chap. xvi. 5, we have the words *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* omitted, where the anticipation of Christ's second coming is out of the question.

In Dissertation the Seventh (Sec. 5,) the Author labours to shew that the scene of the Apocalyptic vision was the Sanctuary. So he explains *ὁ οὐρανός*; and, in answer to the question, 'Why does John call it *the heaven*?' he replies:—

'Because it was so called anciently; though the circumstance has been overlooked, and, in consequence, many passages in the Old Testament in which *השמים*, "the heaven," occurs, have been misunderstood, this term having been referred to *the heaven above*, in places where, in fact, it refers to the typical *sitting-place* or *dwelling*, which God had condescended to establish among the children of Israel.'

We cannot follow the Author into all the particulars of his attempt to prove this point. No competent reader of the He-

brew Bible can be satisfied with it. In no part of that book is the Sanctuary denominated *the heaven*. Of what value is such criticism as the following?

‘In the dedication of the Temple by Solomon (1 Kings ch. viii.) several things are remarkable—“*I have surely built thee an house*” (says Solomon in his address to JEHOVAH) *to dwell in, A SETTLED PLACE* [Heb. מִכֵּן, literally A PREPARED PLACE] *for thee to abide in* (v. 13). *And Solomon stood before the Altar of JEHOVAH, in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands towards heaven*—[Hebrew הַשָּׁמַיִם, “THE HEAVEN”] v. 22. What heaven? Not the region of the clouds, which is sometimes called heaven, as in v. 35—“*When heaven* (שָׁמַיִם without the ה pre-“fixed) *is shut up, and there is no rain,*” &c.; nor *the heaven above*, for in this chapter particular pains are taken to distinguish this heaven from that of which Solomon principally speaks in his dedicatory prayer, by contrasting it with *the earth beneath*, as in v. 23., “*There is no GOD like thee in THE HEAVEN ABOVE nor on THE EARTH BENEATH;*”—and in v. 27. *the heaven of Solomon* (for he made it, as we shall see immediately) is actually put in contrast with *the heaven above*: “*But will GOD indeed DWELL ON THE EARTH?* [viz. at Jerusalem] *behold THE HEAVEN,* [that which Solomon built for him to dwell in at Jerusalem,] *yea THE HEAVEN OF HEAVENS* [the heaven above,] *cannot contain thee, how much less THIS HOUSE which I have built.*” In fact, the place of God’s dwelling or sitting, (for the Hebrew means either,) wherever supposed to be, is called HEAVEN, which is only another name for his dwelling-place, whether the heaven above (otherwise called the Heaven of heavens) be intended, or a prepared place of dwelling, made by his appointment, wherein to give a sensible manifestation of his presence on the earth.” pp. 345—7.

‘But in 2 Chron. vii. 1. a circumstance of great importance is noticed, which is not stated in the book of Kings:—“*And when Solomon had ended his prayer, and the fire descended FROM THE HEAVEN, and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices; for the brightness of JEHOVAH had filled the house; then the priests could not enter into the house of JEHOVAH, because the brightness (or glory) of JEHOVAH had filled the house of JEHOVAH.*” The answer thus given to the prayer of Solomon, in the presence of all the worshippers, gave evidence that God had accepted the house, the sanctuary,—the heaven, the place prepared for his sitting; for the fire here spoken of descended, not from “*heaven above,*” but, from *the heaven, THE PREPARED PLACE,*—from the cloud which covered the mercy-seat in the holy of the holies.’ p. 351.

The fire is not said to have come out from the Sanctuary, or from the cloud which covered the mercy seat. The fire הַשָּׁמַיִם descended from heaven. In 2 Kings i. 10, the same expression occurs; and certainly the fire which destroyed the fifty captains, did not proceed from the Temple: like the fire which

consumed the sacrifices of Solomon, it came down from the heaven above. We are surprised that any such interpretation should be given of 1 Kings viii. 27, as that which we have copied from the Author in the former part of the preceding extract:—Behold the heavens, (the Sanctuary built by Solomon) yea, the heaven of heavens (the heaven above) cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have built.—The Sanctuary, a part of the Temple, cannot confine the Divine Majesty; much less can the whole Temple. Or, the Temple, the house erected by Solomon, cannot contain thee; how much less can the Temple, the house built by Solomon, contain thee!

In concluding our notice of this work, we are anxious to do justice to the merits of the Author. He may fairly be represented as having brought under the notice of biblical students some very interesting topics, and he has furnished many ingenious and curious remarks on the several subjects of his Dissertations, although, in but too many cases, he has exhibited them in a crude and unsubstantial form.

Art. V. *History of the European Languages; or Researches into the Affinities of the Teutonic, Greek, Celtic, Slavonic, and Indian Nations.* By the late Alexander Murray, D.D. Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Edinburgh. With a Life of the Author. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. cxxviii, 976. Price 1l. 8s. Edinburgh, 1823.

THAT the word *breeches* is derived from bear-riches, and *barbecued* from Bladud-kuid,—that the verb was the first invented part of speech, and that all the languages of Europe are composed of the elementary radicals, *Ag, bag, dag, gag, lag, mag, nag, rag, and sag*;—such is the purport of the information and train of reasoning which occupy 480 pages of text, and nearly 500 of Facts and Illustrations in these bulky volumes. The meaning which the Author considered as attaching to each of these radicals, will be best explained by the following extract. Well might he preface it with the remark, that ‘Taste and philosophy will receive with aversion the rude syllables which are the base of that medium through which Homer, and Milton, and Newton have delighted or illumined mankind.’

‘1. To strike or move with swift equable penetrating or sharp effect was *AG! AG!*

‘If the motion was less sudden, but of the same species, *WAG.*

‘If made with force and a great effort, *HwAG.*

‘These are varieties of one word, originally used to mark the motion of fire, water, wind, darts.

‘II. To strike with a quick, vigorous, impelling force, BAG or BWAG, of which FAG and PAG are softer varieties.

‘III. To strike with a harsh, violent, strong blow, DWAG, of which THWAG and TWAG are varieties.

‘IV. To move or strike with a quick tottering unequal impulse, GWAG or CWAG.

‘V. To strike with a pliant slap, LAG and HLAG.

‘VI. To press by strong force or impulse so as to condense, bruise, or compel, MAG.

‘VII. To strike with a crushing destroying power, NAG and HNAG.

‘VIII. To strike with a strong, rude, sharp, penetrating power, RAG or HRAG.

‘IX. To move with a weighty strong impulse, SWAG.

‘These NINE WORDS are the foundations of language, on which an edifice has been erected of a more useful and wonderful kind, than any which have exercised human ingenuity. They were uttered at first, and probably for several generations, in an insulated manner. The circumstances of the actions were communicated by gestures, and the variable tunes of the voice; but the actions themselves were expressed by their suitable monosyllable. External objects are known only by their qualities: each quality was considered as an agent; the character of its actions suggested the appropriate syllable, which was the verb, noun, and adjective of that quality, at the pleasure of the speaker. When fire burnt or moved in a stream of flame, AG denoted its action, itself, and its bright or penetrating quality. When water yielded to the pressure of the foot or hand, it was WAG; when it rushed in a stream, it was RAG. When a man simply moved along, the term was WAG; when he moved by quick steps, it was GAG; but if he ran, it was RAG. If he struck another a vigorous blow with his fist, the word was BAG; if he did the same with a staff or branch of a tree, it was LAG; if he stabbed him with a sharp object, it was RAG; if he dashed him down to the ground, it was DWAG; and if he put him to death by bruising him when fallen, the expression was MAG. For the same reasons the names of objects varied. WAG was moving, GAG was going, RAG was running, BAG was beating, LAG was laying or licking, RAG was wounding or cutting, DAG was striking violently, and MAG was murder.

‘When any of the actions denoted by these primitive words was rapidly done in a diminished manner, and with less force, the broad sound of the proper syllable was changed into a slender one. Thus LIG was a slight blow: DIG, and TIG, and RIG, were diminutives of DAG, TAG, and RAG, whether used as verbs or nouns.’

‘*Satin’ sanus aut sobrius?* is a question which most persons will be disposed to ask respecting the learned visionary who could coolly state, that mankind had only to *strike*, and to invent these nine monosyllables to express the idea of striking,

and that having articulated them with corresponding gestures for several generations, they at length learned to frame this rude gamut into the infinite diversities of speech. 'Language,' says Dr. Murray, 'was formed by man in the exercise of perception, memory, abstraction, and judgement, the natural faculties of the human mind.' 'The imperfect system of communication of thought, formed by children and the deaf, in civilized nations, is the principal one still in use among savages: it must have been the only one before the introduction of articulate speech.' (pp. 28, 9.) 'That the inventors of our parent tongue were *rational*, though rude in speech, is not to be disputed!!' It was formerly believed, that there was once a time when mankind were *mutum et turpe pecus*; and Vitruvius tells us, that they snored away their time in caves of the rocks and dens of the earth, till accident having given birth to fire, which at first terrified, but afterwards attracted and warmed them, they cesticulated, grunted, groaned, and herding together, at last, *spoke*. *Ita sermones inter se procreaverunt*. Strange things lie hidden in this same philosophy. The sages, however, have not vouchsafed to inform us at what period in the history of man this universal dumbness existed. Æschylus makes Prometheus say, Εξευρον αὐτοῖς γραμματῶν τὸ σὺνθεσις—'I found out for them (mankind) the composition of letters,' or the art of writing. But no one has ever arrogated to himself, or had ascribed to him, the invention of speech. It is an invention, say the philosophers, which was made by somebody, at some time, and in some place; and Dr. Murray tells us that the inventors were 'rational.' It is unnecessary to be more particular, for—*il n'y a que moi au monde qui a toujours raison*.

Had such a theory proceeded from the pen of any dreamer of the infidel school*, we might have passed it over in silent contempt; but, coming as it does from the pen of a reverend doctor of divinity of the venerable Kirk of Scotland, we cannot suppress our astonishment at the consummate ignorance which it displays of the powers and history of man. Whosoever has read and believes the Bible, must admit, that speech is as ancient as Adam; and we think there is sufficient evidence that men have spoken ever since his day. If philosophers will have it, that, before Adam, mankind were dumb,

* How far the following obscure sentiment, however, would justify our classing Dr. Murray with that school, we leave our readers to judge: 'Since this was written, Mr. Horne Tooke has joined that multitude which contains the great, the virtuous, and the learned, of all parties and opinions.' Vol. II. p. 342.

we will not contend that point with them, believing that there was then neither human speech nor human existence; and that if God had not conferred on man the gift of speech as well as existence, he could no more have invented it, than the dog could his barking, the cat her mewling, or the bird its song; no more in fact, than he could have created himself. Such is the true origin of language. Speech is the gift of the Creator. He willed and man spake. The boon, once conferred, became like the breath in our nostrils,—a universal *vitalium* to the species.

Seeing, however, that there was originally but one speech or language, the question naturally suggests itself, whence have arisen all the varieties that now prevail over the face of the whole earth? We would meet this query by putting another: Whence have proceeded all the diversities of form and feature which are observed in the species in different parts of the globe? For every reason that the physiologist can assign for these diversities, we will engage to assign ten reasons for a still greater diversity in the accents of the voice, and ultimately in language. Take what is called the Caucasian family, wherever the scattered branches of that family are found,—in India, Egypt, Barbary, Greece, Italy,—and they may be shewn to be not more specifically characterised by a peculiar physiognomical conformation, than by a universal adherence to the basis of a particular language and articulation. Equally marked is the Mongolian family by the Chinese, Japanese, and Calmuc peculiarities. The African, American, and Malay have not been so accurately examined; but, so far as they have been, the results are found to be similar,—different features, different articulation; the conformation varying with the speech. So that, in the grand *δίκη φωνηέντων*, it is not *το σιγμα προς το ταυ*, nor *το λαμδα προς το ρο*; but it is the Shiboleth *προς το Siboleth* all the world over. Take as a familiar example, the manner in which different nations pronounce the proper name George. A Spaniard writes it *Jorge*, pronouncing it *Χορχε*, remarkably guttural. Were a Cockney required to imitate the pronunciation of the word, he would call it *Corky*. Many a Scot would call it *Coalky*, in which not a vestige of the original word, in form, meaning, or pronunciation, would be left. Ask an Arab to pronounce Corky, and he would call it *Gorky*; or the word would become softened, in some of the Syrian dialects, to *Djorke*; (the actual name of St. George in Syria is Mar Djordos;) while the Bohemian would call it *Yorky*. And thus, we might run through the whole alphabet, all nations dropping and changing letters as caprice, ignorance, or physical peculiarities may dictate. The Arabic language wants

the letter B. In the Mexican, B, D, F, Q, and R are said to be wanting. The Russian alphabet has a letter, the power of which it takes five letters to express in English—Shdch. Similar anomalies are to be found in almost every alphabet and dialect, and there can be no room for hesitation in referring them, in many cases, to a physiological origin.

Another prime source of the diversity of language, in the transition from a spoken to a written dialect, is the different manner in which the same sound may strike on the ear of several individuals, and the different manner in which it would consequently be written by persons who had nothing but the sound to direct them in taking it down. Ask a dozen illiterate clowns to spell the same word, and every one of them will, probably, do it differently,—and it may be without putting in it a single letter that properly enters into its composition. We have heard of usage being spelt *Goozitch*, and have seen many other words equally distorted from their native orthography. This is not the place to endeavour to account for the great diversity of alphabets, but we may just remark, in passing, that they are all deducible from one original. The oldest method of writing was that which is seen in the Mexican manuscripts, and which consisted in rude representations of the objects. The next step was, to the phonetic use of these idiographic signs or pictures; and the third was, to the formation of an epistolographic character, or running-hand, in which the form of the original symbol can no longer be identified. But the Alphabet stands out as a distinct invention, and, amid all its various modifications, there is strong reason to believe that the first alphabet has been the parent of every other. Dr. Murray remarks, that the evidence of its Phenician origin is the most probable of any. ‘The letters suit the Phenician or Hebrew language: their names are Phenician. Other nations received them from the Phenicians. Moses wrote in the Phenician character, of which the Chaldee is a less genuine and less original variety.’ Moses, however, was indebted for all his learning to the Egyptian priesthood, nor does he appear to have had any intercourse with the Phenicians. In Egypt, at that period, we may safely assume, that Alphabetic writing was unknown; for it cannot be supposed that, with the knowledge of the alphabet, so clumsy and troublesome a method would have been adhered to for ages, as the symbolic and syllabic characters. Yet, in Egypt, the very cradle of science, might such an invention, if it be a human invention, have been expected to originate. Had there been an Egyptian alphabet at that period, it is natural, however, to conclude that Moses would have adopted it, rather than have borrowed the Phenician.

cian character, and the Egyptian too would doubtless have been carried into Greece. Yet, Dr. Murray, while he contends for the Phenician origin of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, and Sanscrit alphabets, strangely and perversely affirms, that 'the alphabet was undoubtedly invented a considerable time before the birth of Moses, not in India, but in Egypt.' He assigns no reason for this gratuitous assertion, nor is it supported by the shadow of a reason. But, sooner than make the Phenician Cadmus indebted to the Hebrew lawgiver, who, inspiration apart, is by his genius, learning, and profound legislative wisdom, elevated so immeasurably above every philosopher of antiquity, that, on this ground alone, there would be the strongest presumption in favour of our assigning the invention to him,—the learned Philologist would first make the *Phenician* alphabet to have originated in Egypt, and then Moses must have borrowed it from the Phenicians, with whom he never came in contact!

'When the Greeks received the Phenician alphabet,' says Dr. Murray, 'they rejected the guttural sounds of those consonants which most nearly resembled vowels, and used the character, not for an aspirate, but for a vowel.' This is but one instance of the various modifications which both the written alphabet and the articulation of words would undergo, on being adopted by other nations. The transformation which Oriental proper names underwent as pronounced by a Greek, strikingly illustrates the origin of diversities of language, as connected with organic and conventional peculiarities. Yet, there can be little doubt, that accident, caprice, and usage have introduced most of those national peculiarities. Take a child born under any latitude, and accustom him, from the first, to every mode of articulation, nasal, guttural, sibilant, aspirate, labial, 'cerebral,' down to the Mexican *tlack* or the South African *cluck*,—and every shiboleth or siboleth will be alike to him, he will be able to mouth with equal facility and eloquence, all the dialects of Babel.

Our learned divine seems inclined, however, to sneer at those philologists who would bottom their researches on 'the Mosaic genealogies,'—Noah's ark, and the confusion of Babel. 'When their raven has left the ark,' says Dr. M., 'he builds his nest on a barren rock with materials of all descriptions.' Undismayed by this sarcasm, we do not hesitate to aver, that from the Ark proceeded the original, and from Babel all the infinite diversifications of all the languages that exist, or that ever have existed since the Flood. And had our learned Author taken his flight from the Ark, instead of from the clouds,—or had he set out from the land of Shinar, instead of sending forth a co-

lony of speechless wretches to sing ag, gag, lag, on the banks of the Aral, he would have had much better success.

The Ark rested on the mountains of Ararat, and the first settlements of mankind after the Deluge were around their base. Here, the language of Noah was spoken, and, as the country has never been uninhabited, that language must, one would think, be preserved in the names of many places still. Yet, no philologist has ever examined the language of that country. Sir William Jones, in his Eighth Discourse, gives a puerile reason for having never studied it, —because he had not heard of any original composition in Armenian! One would have thought that the language of the first inhabited country in the post-diluvian world would have presented, in that very circumstance, sufficient inducement to a philologist to study it. Dr. Murray, in the work before us, says: 'I regret that my situation does not permit me to have recourse to the Armenian language.' (vol. ii. p. 372). These two individuals have examined a greater number, the one of European, the other of Asiatic languages, than, probably, any two men ever did before; and both confess, that all the languages they had examined, point to some more ancient tongue as their common parent. Taking the history of our species from the only authentic record, the Scriptures, that language must have been the one originally spoken in Armenia. Is it an unreasonable supposition, then, that traces of it may yet exist in the vernacular dialect of that country, the natives of which are the almost universal interpreters of the Eastern world, as well as the most enterprising merchants among the Asiatic nations? We cannot but think that this language has never yet received from philologists the attention it claims.

Dr. Murray adopts the commonly received opinion, which derives the European nations from five primary tribes,—the Celtæ, the Teutones, the Slavi, the Greeks, and the Finni, all whose respective languages he reduces to one,—the Teutonic. More than two hundred years ago, Mr. Richard Verstegan started the same hypothesis. This language, he says, (ch. vii.) 'is undoubtedly that which at the Confusion of Babel, the Teutonic people (those, I mean, conducted by Tuisco) did speak.' In this language, the learned Author informs us, *Adam* signifies living breath; and *Eve* is, in the Teutonic, as much as to say *Consimilis*, even-the-same; for our word *even* cometh from the Teutonic word *eve*, and likewise, from their *eve-so*, cometh our *even so*; and *shee* was *ever-the-same* as was *Adam* her husband.' Moreover, *Cain*, or *Quain*, means wrathful, angry, or shrewd; *Abel* means an *abel* man; and *Seth* means *set*, i. e. in room of *Abel*! Justus Lipsius, Rodericus

Toletanus, and many others have maintained the same opinion ; and Goropius Becanus contended that the Teutonic was the language of Paradise, supporting this position by arguments, Ortelius says, which no one would be able to refute. Such are the reveries of the learned. The ' great' Scaliger was of opinion, that there are eleven mother tongues in Europe, so distinct as to have no affinity to each other. Others make the primary languages of Europe amount to thirteen, and some to fourteen, six of which are spoken in Great Britain and Ireland. Dr. Murray, on the contrary, first reduces them to five ; these five he ' re-unites' in one ; and that one he resolves into nine elementary monosyllables ! But his discoveries do not stop here. He says :

' When the words of a language are alphabetically arranged, there is but one radical under each consonant, from which all the words beginning with that consonant descend.' Vol. I. p. 228.

One brief extract will be the best comment on this marvellous doctrine.

' Nothing displays the process of compound language in a more practical point of view, than the list of Saxon or Teutonic words under w, and hw, in any good dictionary. In the single sense of move, or turn, we find WAG, WAGGEL : WAD for WAGD, step ; WADDLE, its diminutive ; WAEF, move like a weaver ; WAF, move like wind ; WIT, move or go ; WIC, turn away, retire ; contractions of WIGD, and WIGIG : WOG, or WOH, moved, turned, crooked ; WOGED, or WOD, moved in mind, raised, mad ; WOFFA, a mad man : WOF, wander in madness, rave ; WAND, WAEND, WEND, wind ; contractions of WAGEND, turning ; which signify, as verbs, turn, go, walk, turn away, change by turning ; turn away for fear, or through respect, venerate ; WINTLE, a short turn ; WONDER, a state of fear and awe, from WAND, fear ; WANDER, a turning back and forward, as is done by people ignorant of their way ; WEAL, or HWEAL, turn, roll, from WEGEL, WEOLC, and WEALC, make little turns, walk, felt cloth by turning back and forward, roll as waves, waters, and clouds ; WEOLC, or WELC, a turned shell, nearly the same as WINCLE ; WIL, turn to, incline, bend towards, will, from WIGED ; WEN, incline, turn to ; WENSC, a turning of the mind to an event, a wish ; WIG, turn, stir in a place ; also a habitation ; WIGN, or WIN, dwell ; WON, a dwelling-place, a haunt ; WONT, or WONED, haunted, dwelt, used ; WAE, and WEAL, turn round as a pool, or as boiling water ; WAER, WAR, WEOR, WYR, from WIGR, or WAEGER, turn, move about, circle, go ; HWEOREL, whirl ; HWEORB, and HWEORF, turn, whirl ; WEORC, for WIGERIC, motion, activity of body, work ; WEOC, a turn of time or of office, a week ; also a twisted wick for a candle ; WATH, for WAGTH, wandering ; WITH, and WATEL, a twisted willow twig ; WIG, wave, consecrate, hallow.

'These are derivatives of *WAG*, taken only in one of its numerous senses.' pp. 447, 448.

As a specimen of etymology, take the following :

'Dash, *DWAGS*, *DWASCH* ; die, *DEAG*, *DWEAG*, become weak, soft, insensible, as if crushed or beaten. Dull is *DOFL*, *DEAFL*, *DOBL* ; deaf is *DEAF*, *DAUBS* in Visigothic ; dumb is *DOMB*, *DAUBN*, and *DAUBENIBA*, all from *DWAG-BA*, bruised, blunt, obtuse in mind, body, ears, voice, and eyes ; for the Greek *TUPHLOS* is from *DOFEL*. Dull is also what is not firm, deaf, douf, hollow.' p. 154.

We deem it unnecessary to add any further remarks on this most philosophical history of language. Of all theorists, a philological one is the wildest. These volumes deserve to rank among the curiosities of literature. Never was profound learning allied to greater imbecility as manifested in the use of it. As to the attempt to shew that the verb was the first invented part of speech, it strikes us as very much like undertaking to prove that fire existed before fuel.

Art. VI. *A Manual of Devotion* ; being Meditations and Hymns for every Day in the Month. By Mary Holderness, Author of "New Russia" and "Manners and Customs of the Crim Tartars." 12mo. pp. 152. Price 4s. London, 1825.

THE little volumes by which Mrs. Holderness is known to the public, were the result of, we believe, an involuntary residence of several years among the semi-barbarous hordes of New Russia. The preface to the present work alludes to the trials which the Author has been called to sustain, in a manner which will not fail to create an interest in the minds of our readers, and pre-dispose them in favour of these simple effusions of heart-felt experimental piety.

'Called to much trial, and exercised in the school of Affliction, I have had more than common reason to be grateful for the sustaining influence of Religion ; and under all difficulties and dangers and trials, like David, to say, "Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice :"—"My soul shall be joyful in the Lord ; it shall rejoice in the God of my salvation."

'Induced by peculiar exigencies to make some more than usual effort for my Family, I desired to do that which, through the blessing of God, might induce others to seek that refuge from the storm, which it has happily been my lot to have chosen, or, that it might at least give me the privilege, the Christian's exalted privilege, of magnifying God on earth.'

We shall make room for an entire meditation with the an-

nexed hymn, and leave these specimens of unaffected Scriptural piety to speak for themselves in recommendation of the volume.

‘ SEVENTEENTH DAY.

ON THE SABBATH.

‘ “ *A day in thy courts is better than a thousand ; I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.*” Ps. lxxxiv. 10.

‘ The ardent delight which David expresses in the privileges of public worship, must be more or less felt and acknowledged by all such as worship the Lord their God in spirit and in truth. Yet that too many live in contempt of the holy ordinances of the Sabbath, or in a cold and formal observance of them, it is to be feared, the experience of all Christians will find a subject of mourning and regret.

‘ We realize one of the promises of our great and merciful God, when we find some degree of spiritual growth, a blessing consequent upon the keeping holy the Sabbath. “ If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day ; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable ; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words, *then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord.*”

‘ It has been said, that the keeping holy the Sabbath, is no where so strictly enjoined in the New Testament, as it was under the Mosaic dispensation. But let it be remembered that our blessed Lord said, “ Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets ; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” And St. Paul also saith, “ Do we then make void the law through faith ? God forbid ; yea, we establish the law.” And indeed we might as reasonably contend for the dismissing or annulling any other of the Commandments from the Decalogue, as seek to remove the force of that which enjoins us to consecrate one day in seven to the service of our God, to the concerns of immortality, and to the hopes of a glorious resurrection.

‘ Oh ! if we be indeed persuaded that we must soon enter into that eternal world, from whence there is no returning ; surely we shall not only be ready to rest from the cares and pursuits of this world, and meditate upon the things which belong unto our peace, but we shall with joy hail each revolving Sabbath, and in humble gratitude acknowledge the infinite mercy of our God, in giving to his people so great and inestimable a blessing.

‘ Retire then, Oh my soul ! and in the inmost recesses of the chamber, pour out in humble prayer and ardent praise, thy feelings to thy God ; let it be to thee a joyful and a valued privilege, to spend this holy and consecrated day peculiarly as in his presence ; either in the public sanctuary, in private communion, in family worship, or in conversation holy and profitable for thy eternal good.

‘ Carry with thee to God’s house, a spirit of lively devotion for prayer, a spirit of solemn attention to hear ; that the preaching of the word may not be in vain unto thee, but that it may be found by thee

"profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" that thou mayest become "perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works." At home, recount the unwearied mercies of thy Heavenly Father, and think upon his unbounded love.

'What possessest thou, which his bounty hath not given? What attainment dost thou own, which may not be converted to his praise? Think not, if thou be rich, thou hast no need to ask his blessing; think not, if thou art poor, thou art beneath his notice; think not, if thou be afflicted, that his anger having chastened, his mercy will not hear thee; think not (sinner though thou art) his mercy will not spare thee. Seek the Lord thy God, and honour his holy Sabbath; for "all the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth, unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies;" "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous."

' HYMN.

' The brightest hours of bliss below,
Are those when to my God I flee;
The purest joy this heart can know,
Is high communion held with Thee.

' When this deep-feeling anxious heart
Pours out its griefs in fervent pray'r,
Implores the strength thou canst impart,
And seeks a Heav'nly Father's care:

' Shall not it's fears be hushed to rest,
When 'tis assured that God is nigh?
His presence makes the mourner blest—
He comes to wipe the tear-fraught eye.

' With joy I to thy presence speed,
With love I to thy courts repair;
Convinc'd, whate'er the sinner's need,
He'll find his God and Saviour there.

' When grateful voices loudly raise,
And high the peeling organ swells
The notes of prayer and ardent praise—
On these my heart with rapture dwells.

' To listen to the sacred lore,
To learn thy love and gracious will,
To contemplate thy mercy's store,
Be my delight and pleasure still.

' Full oft my heart and eyes o'erflow
With grateful feeling's magic pow'r;
Triumphant over all below,
My soul enjoys the sacred hour.

' For ever in thy courts to dwell,
Were bliss too pure on earth to be:
But Oh! attune my tongue to tell
How great the bliss of loving thee!

Art. VII. 1. "*The Progress of Dissent*;" containing Observations on the remarkable and amusing Passages of that Article in the Sixty-first Number of the Quarterly Review: addressed to the Editor. By a Nonconformist. 8vo. pp. 140. Price 2s. 6d. London. 1825.

2. *The Protestant Dissenter's Catechism*; containing—1. A Brief History of the Dissenters. 2. The Reasons of Dissent from the National Church. The Seventeenth Edition, with an Appendix and Preface. By William Newman, D. D. 12mo. Price 1s. London. 1823.

AT length we have endeavoured to do our duty. Where-soever the English language is understood, there will 'this Review go forth.'*—Such is the imperial tone in which the Conductors of the Quarterly Review now think themselves warranted to speak of their critical labours. On the strength of a large sale, which is not precisely synonymous with a rising reputation, this 'holy alliance' of literature, the Church, Albemarle-street, and the Admiralty, imagine that they may dispose of facts, doctrines, and reputations, in the same style as the Congress of sovereigns partitioned territories, and cut and shuffled nations. We deeply feel our comparative insignificance in the presence of this mighty boaster; we have no such means of forcing our way into high places, and making our voice to be heard. Nevertheless, we have a duty to perform to our readers, and to ourselves, which forbids our passing over in silence the wanton aggressions of this literary autocrat.

The tract which stands second at the head of this article, has lately obtained very distinguishing attention, no fewer than three Reviews in the interest of the hierarchy having condescended to notice it. To review a pamphlet for the first time in its seventeenth edition, when its Author has been deceased more than twelve years, is a somewhat unusual mode of proceeding; and in the present instance, the circumstance is the more remarkable, inasmuch as other recent publications bearing on the same points, have been passed over in expressive silence. We happen to know that the writer of one of the articles alluded to, had forwarded to him, by his own desire, several of these publications, (among others, Mr. Conder's work,) for the purpose of reviewing; but, when the Number appeared, lo! an article on Mr. Palmer's Catechism! The Quar-

* No. lxi. p. 125.

terly Reviewer affects to consider this tract as 'a sort of official publication, being a modified reprint of *the old standard work among Dissenters.*' For this representation there is not the slightest ground: it has not a single mark of an official or semi-official publication. It has not the recommendation of any name affixed to it besides that of the Editor,—a deservedly respected individual, but who would indignantly repel the charge of having put forth this Catechism in the name and on the responsibility of the body to which he belongs. It can only be in sarcasm, or for the purpose of misrepresentation, that this Reviewer styles this Catechism, a 'standard work' among the Dissenters. We cannot give him credit for so much ignorance. There are tracts explanatory of the principles of Dissent which have obtained a ten-fold larger circulation. But, if he never met with any of these, he must have *heard* of Towgood's Letters to White, which, perhaps, has some claim to be styled a standard work among Dissenters, as it is a staggering work among Churchmen,—a work which it would have been worthy of the prowess of a Quarterly Reviewer to encounter. We say nothing of Mr. Conder's work for obvious reasons,—although it might be presumed to be not less a standard work, than the Protestant Dissenters' Catechism. The Reviewer is, in fact, pleased to refer to it as a work of superior pretensions, and to style its Author 'the defender of Protestant Nonconformity.' Mr. Conder would, we are persuaded, feel duly grateful for the high honour conferred upon him by this condescending reference, slight and passing as it is, were it not that the compliment has attached to it, the drawback of a gross misrepresentation, and, founded on that misrepresentation, a sweeping charge of intolerance. In a passage cited by the Reviewer, the 'Defender of Nonconformity' ventures to put the question, What is the Scriptural character of the possessors, the proprietors of this world? 'Whom,* under any conceivable change in human affairs, which should leave human nature itself unchanged, can we expect them to be, but such as the inspired writers emphatically denominate the men of this world; men who "discern not the things of the Spirit of God."'

* This charitable and sweeping condemnation, be it observed, says the Reviewer, 'comprises in its sweeping malediction, all the prelates and chief ministers of the crown, in whom the greatest part of church patronage is usually vested.'

By what spirit was the Reviewer actuated when he termed

* Printed in the Review, '*How,*' under any, &c.

the statement we have transcribed, a malediction? According to this use of the word, the Apostolic writings are full of maledictions. No candid reader could possibly misunderstand the passage referred to, as denying that any devout and spiritual individuals are to be found among the higher classes. The very next sentence fixes the meaning in a qualified sense, —that such is not, and never can be expected to be, the *prevailing* character of the mighty, the noble, and the rich. Is the Reviewer prepared to maintain the reverse of this proposition? Will he venture, in the teeth of facts and of every Scriptural representation of human nature, to contend that ‘all the prelates and the chief ministers of the crown,’ and other holders and dispensers of church patronage, are men enlightened by the Spirit of God, and characterised by those qualities which constitute, in the Scriptural sense of the word, a spiritual, in contradistinction to a worldly man. The Author is speaking of the questionable competency of the bulk of patrons, to judge of the qualifications of the men on whom they bestow livings. He maintains that they are for the most part secular and irreligious men. Not a word is said by him of prelates and ministers of the crown, but the Reviewer introduces their names for an obvious purpose. Let them be included, however, in the general statement; and we again ask, will this writer carry his sycophancy so far as to maintain that the prevailing character of the higher classes in this country, is that of men of piety and spiritual discernment? We imagine that he would not; for he has not dared directly to impugn the statement he misrepresents. But if he would not maintain this, where is his candour, where his honesty, in attempting to fasten on the ‘Defender of Nonconformity,’ an invidious opinion, a ‘malediction,’ when his own observation and conscience admonish him that the statement is in accordance with notorious fact?

We shall have occasion to recur to the sentiment in question; but, before we dismiss the Catechism which has led to this digression, we must in fairness state, that while we give great credit to Dr. Newman for his modifications of the original, we are not prepared to give our sanction to its republication. Several years ago, the Writer of this Article had occasion to examine the Catechism, with a view to revising it for the press; but the result was, a conviction that it was not an eligible form in which to exhibit either the history of the Dissenters or the reasons of Dissent. This conviction has been strengthened by the readiness which the Reviewers referred to have shewn to drag it into notice,—a sure indication that *they* consider it as ineffective and harmless. In the first place, an

historical catechism has always appeared to us a most bungling method of teaching history. Historical questions, referring the pupil to a work from which he is to derive the proper answers, are quite a distinct method of instruction; and a most excellent one. Then, we object to the very first question in the history, and still more strongly to the answer which is given to it. To speak of '*the Pagan Religion*,' is absurd; to name *it* the first of the '*four*,' is grossly improper; to class the '*four*' together, and not add a word either as to their distinguishing characteristics, or the evidence which proves the Christian to be the only true religion, is the height of injudiciousness and impropriety. This single question, placed as it is in the front of the Catechism, might almost seem to give colour to the first part of Bishop Horsley's condemnatory sentence. We will not pursue our criticism. To the sentiments and statements of the Catechism, we should not find much occasion seriously to object, nor are we aware that it contains *one* 'thrice refuted calumny against the Church;' but we regard the catechetical form as a vehicle wholly unsuitable for the sentiments and information which the work comprises, and we very much doubt the useful tendency of such a mode of stating and inculcating the principles of Dissent. The liberties which Dr. Newman has taken with the original, shew that he was far from satisfied with it, and he must pardon us for carrying our dissatisfaction still further, so as to apply to its republication in any shape.

We return to the Quarterly Reviewer. The object of the somewhat singular article in question is, to vindicate the clergy from 'the general impeachment upon their conduct' which is often deduced from the progress of Dissent.' It is honestly admitted, that Dissent has made progress in this country;—that its progress has begun to occupy public attention, and that too in influential quarters;—and that inferences have been drawn from that circumstance, not in perfect unison with Paley's doctrine of the expediency of an Establishment. In plain words, the immense revenues of the Established Church of Great Britain and Ireland have begun to attract the attention of the nation's representatives. Who those persons are, that have been guilty of sacrilegiously mooting this delicate point, the Reviewer tells us—'the blundering demagogue, the bitter and envious Dissenter, and the artful infidel.' He means Mr. Hume and Mr. Bentham, and the Dissenter is suspended between the two for the sake of completing the triumvirate. On the part of the Dissenters, this attack of the Quarterly Reviewer has been wholly unprovoked. *They* have not been bringing impeachments against the clergy. *They*

have not been petitioning against tithes and church-building. The Dissenters of this kingdom never led more quiet and peaceable lives: and unless, like troublesome children, their being quiet is deemed a proof that they are busy with mischief, we cannot conceive of any occasion that they have given to these new demonstrations of activity and alarm among the churchmen. This Reviewer represents us indeed as having grown most complacent towards Mother Church. 'That the interests of the Church,' he says, 'are dear to the nation at large; that by the Dissenters themselves it is considered absolutely necessary for the maintenance of true religion in this country, we have no doubt whatever.' Fond man, he may not doubt it, but he is mistaken for all that. 'A few sour fanatics,' he adds, 'and a few cross-grained politicians may look forward with bitter hope to its downfall, or with greedy anticipation to its plunder.' A tolerably intelligible insinuation that all who do not think the Church Establishment absolutely necessary for the maintenance of true religion, belong to one of these classes. But what does this pretty word *plunder* mean? Suppose the case—that any portion whatever of the Church property were applied by Parliament to the relief of the public burdens and the further diminution of taxation, what individuals would gain any plunder by it? In imputing such base and mercenary motives to any cross-grained politicians, the Reviewer sins not more grossly against charity than against good sense. He must be thinking of the suppression of monasteries. But a politician must not only be cross-grained but light-headed, not merely greedy but mad, to dream, at this time of day, of coming in for plunder, in case of the suppression of prebends and chapters, or any other alienation of unproductive church property.

But leaving the politicians and fanatics to answer for themselves, we shall confine ourselves for the present, to the causes adduced by the Reviewer, as accounting for the diminished influence of the clergy, and the accession to the Dissenters. The first and greatest cause has been, he contends, the enormous increase of local population, in connexion with the supineness of—the clergy? Oh, no, 'If any where, the blame clearly attaches to the legislature.' The clergy, no doubt, did all they could do. As the population increased, and their tithes increased, they doubled their exertions, and finding their churches overflowing, made every effort to provide church-room for the poor! They are not to blame if the Legislature turned a deaf ear to their petitions, and left unencouraged and unrewarded their activity and zeal. Was it so? We shall

avail ourselves of the plain questions put by a Nonconformist, by way of reply.

‘ 1. I desire to ask, what affinity there can possibly be between *empty* churches, and an *increasing* population? I can readily conceive, if a town or city were gradually depopulated, that the church would suffer a reduction in its members; but, when your Reviewer argues, that the population has increased, and therefore the church has diminished, I must beg to decline his inference. 2. I would inquire, if the increase of population was really against the clergyman, how it could be in favour of the Dissenter? Surely this is very paradoxical. If the growing numbers of the people widened the field of labour to the Dissenter, could it by the same circumstance be narrowed to the Churchman?

‘ But “towns,” you say, “sprang up like an exhalation, in districts which were thinly occupied by a scattered agricultural population.” And if this were the case, had not the Church every advantage against Dissent? Were not her ten thousand ministers already planted over the face of the land, to take the full benefit of these occurrences? Whatever changes might happen, could a town arise, or even an individual be born, in any spot not previously brought within the well-defined limits of some parish? Had not that parish a priest? And was not the priest then in a state of local preparation to observe the growing wants of his charge, while as yet Dissent and Dissenters were not perhaps known to his borders?

‘ Yet, your Reviewer continues, whatever the priest might have done, *church-room* would be wanting. But will your Reviewer inform me, if this was to the disadvantage of the Church, how it could be to the advantage of the Dissenter? The Dissenter was poor and feeble, and had the tide of general opinion against him: the Church was wealthy, had a powerful representation in the Court, the Cabinet, and the Parliament, and could tax the whole land to effect her object. If both parties were, therefore, seeking to afford advancing accommodation as the people multiplied, it is most obvious where all the facilities must rest. The Dissenter would have to do it alone and out of his penury; the Churchman, from his ample resources of wealth and influence.

‘ What the Dissenters have done, the Church could have done, “and much more abundantly.” I must refer, therefore, the continuance of the evil, on her part, not to the absence of power, but of *disposition*. Indeed, the Reviewer, in his eagerness to mark the motives of the Dissenters, has unconsciously committed himself to the same opinion. “In the mean time,” he says, that is, while the population was increasing, and the Church was indolent, “the Dissenters perceived and seized their advantage.” Yes, this is exactly the fact; the Dissenters saw, and the Church did not see. The Dissenters did their best to meet the moral and spiritual wants of the nation on this emergency; the Church was content to do nothing, was blind to the demands of the occasion, and was only moved into constrained effort by her ultimate jealousy of rival exertions. The history of the

last twenty years is "attestation strong," in support of this statement. When the Dissenters, and a few pious clergymen, originated the Bible Society, the Church first fulminated her wrath, and finding her bolts fell, like the dart of Priam, innoxious to the ground, she betook herself, with better purpose, to the revival of the "Bartlett's Buildings Society," and the formation of a "Prayer Book and Homily Society." When the Dissenters embodied themselves into a "Missionary Society," another slowly followed among the serious clergy; while the Church, after vain and various resistance, is at last inoculated with the spirit of the times, though the virus has not taken so happily as might be wished, and is sending forth her mitred and unmitred missionaries. When the Dissenters had carried the Lancasterian plans of education over the nation, then the Church formed a "National Society" for the education of the people; and when the system of the Sunday Schools, by far the least exceptionable for the instruction of the poor, had been used so efficaciously by the Dissenters, many of the clergy sought to avail themselves of it, but wanting gratuitous and suitable teachers, it has generally amounted to a failure. And finally, when the Dissenters were doing their utmost to provide local accommodation for the worship of the people, and had really done more than their friends or foes expected, the Church was awakened by fear from her slumbers, lifted up her voice in the senate for more, and still more churches; and her only surprise has been to find, that her application was deemed so reasonable in its nature, and so late in its arrival.

'However serious my detail may appear, Mr. Editor, the inference I derive from it, I doubt not, will divert you. It is, that Dissent is necessary to the Church. That they are two elements making one existence,—that the erratic and pungent spirit of nonconformity acts like the galvanic shock on the plethoric habits of the mother church, keeps her among living things, and renders her in advanced age verdant and fruitful;—that, without Dissenters, we should have had no National Schools, no Episcopal Missionaries, no new churches; and consequently, that we Dissenters are the great, original benefactors of the land.' pp. 14—16.

The Reviewer may not have the candour to admit as much as this; and yet, in speaking of the 'fair opposition of religious zeal and activity,' he virtually concedes to the exertions of the Dissenters the merit of an immense political benefit. We are not so unreasonable, however, as to look for gratitude in the clergy towards their opponents. Dr. Chalmers, indeed, has done himself honour by the manly testimony he has borne to the Dissenters in this respect. 'We shall ever,' he says, 'look upon Dissenters as great moral benefactors of their country. They call forth a most salutary reaction in the Church. They exert a most salutary control over the dispensers of patronage. They do make such progress at times as to perplex and alarm the bigots of an Establishment. But such

‘ we believe to be the native preference of our people for our
 ‘ Establishments, that we feel quite confident and secure that
 ‘ the Dissenters *will never make more progress than they deserve to*
 ‘ *make*; and that they will never obtain such an ascendancy
 ‘ over the mind of the country as to lead to the subversion of
 ‘ its religious establishments, till these establishments deserve
 ‘ to be subverted.’ This is language worthy of a Christian
 patriot. But the Reviewer, while he does not pretend to deny
 that the best and most disinterested motives have prompted, in
 many instances, the exertions of the Dissenters, complains
 that the spirit of pecuniary speculation has mingled itself with
 this religious zeal; and he thinks it hard that the clergy should
 have to struggle with that unfair class of competitors, the cha-
 pel-builders and the chapel-proprietors. ‘ This consolidation
 ‘ of interest with religious zeal,’ he says, ‘ animates and sup-
 ‘ ports the system of proselytism which is the life of all dis-
 ‘ sent.’ It is not very obvious, what the motives of indivi-
 duals have to do with the fairness of the competition against
 which the clergy have had to stand. If chapels are built as a
 pecuniary speculation, it proves that there is a want of what is
 termed church-room,—that there is a demand for the article
 supplied. But, in order to make church-room, when so pro-
 vided, from whatever motive, a valuable property,—to render
 the rent a source of income,—there is but one expedient that
 is found to succeed; the pulpit must be effectively supplied.
 When this is not the case, notwithstanding the increase of
 population, there will be found, whether in church or chapel,
 empty pews. The Reviewer represents, indeed, that the cha-
 pel-proprietors will, in such cases, go canvassing about the
 neighbourhood for ‘ proselytes ;’—nay, that possessors of houses
 will stipulate that their tenants shall take a pew in the con-
 venticle. Such things may be done by Churchmen: they are
 not done by Dissenters. Numerous cases have come within
 our personal knowledge, in which these disgraceful expedients
 have been resorted to for the purpose of filling a church;—in
 which tenants have been discarded for attending the meeting,
 and labourers have been threatened with the loss of work, or a
 retrenchment of parochial relief, if they persisted in going to
 the conventicle. When the Reviewer affirms, that ‘ in the na-
 ‘ ture of things, this system of proselytism cannot be so ac-
 ‘ tively exerted in favour of what is old and established,’—he
 asserts what is contrary alike to reason and to fact. We say
 that this system of proselytism is carried on in favour of the
 clergy, but we never heard of a single instance in which it was
 employed against them. We do not say that such a thing may
 not have happened, but, in representing it as one of the causes
 of the progress of Dissent, the Reviewer must be understood

as charging this upon the Dissenters as a common practice. It is a calumny. Either he has been grossly misinformed, and is disqualified by his ignorance for the task he has undertaken, or he is guilty of a degree of disingenuousness which ill accords with the sensitive horror he attributes to the clergy with regard to any infringement on the ninth commandment of the Decalogue.

But is it the advocate of Ecclesiastical Establishments who complains of the consolidation of interest with religious zeal, as animating and supporting the system of Dissent? Why, the whole fabric of the Church is built on this principle. The Reviewer talks of 'Tabernacle bonds' being as marketable securities as Mexican scrip.' What are advowsons? How can the competition which is so pathetically complained of, be unfair, even if the Reviewer's statements be correct? He means, perhaps, to say, that Dissenters are following the Church too closely—fighting the clergy with their own weapons. So far as there is any slender foundation for this statement, such a circumstance can with no propriety be reckoned among the causes of the progress of Dissent: it is simply an effect and indication of that progress. And so far as it exists, we believe that its influence on the prosperity of that cause is prejudicial, for this reason; that Dissent, as a cause, must ever rise and fall in this country in proportion as it is identified with the maintenance and promotion of the religion of Christ in its evangelical purity. As Dissent has no other object than this, so, it has no other basis or conservative principle. Exclude evangelical religion from the pulpits of the Establishment, and you would make the cause of Dissent triumphant, because that identification would be complete, and then, wo to the Church. But let Dissent be despoiled of this its secret strength and primitive glory, or let it cease—and blessed be God it has ceased—to be the exclusive prerogative of Dissenters to uphold the doctrines of the Reformation in this country; as a cause it must grow weaker, for it will have parted with a measure of its attractive force. In the latter case, it is not that its principles have ceased to be less true, but the occasion for recurring to those principles becomes diminished; and thus, without any deviation from its proper course, its influence on the tide of public opinion may be weakened by the operation of a counter attraction.

But the Reviewer is evidently bewildered with phenomena, the laws of which he does not comprehend; and in accounting for the progress of Dissent, he falls into the most ludicrous inconsistencies, which have not escaped the keen observation of the Nonconformist. That any difficulty is found in abandoning a sect for the Establishment, or that it exposes the seceder to

any of the consequences pictured by the Reviewer, our readers well know to be utterly unfounded. The Reviewer is again in error, owing to his arguing from what takes place when a Churchman turns Dissenter, to what he supposes must follow on a Dissenter's turning Churchman. But this statement, which occurs at the top of the page, is contradicted before he gets to the bottom; and the paragraph which sets out with accounting by this means for the progress of Dissent, ends by pointing out one cause that it has not made greater advancement.

We must pass over the remarks of the Reviewer on Sunday evening lectures, which, he admits, have been regarded by the clergy as heterodox and fanatic, purely because they were begun by the Methodists. No doubt, they have aided the progress of Dissent, and the progress of something better than Dissent, apart from which Dissent is a 'cold negation.' The Reviewer's statements amount to this, and, says our Non-conformist, 'we thank him for his candour,'—that

'the Dissenter has considered the people, the Clergy have considered themselves. The Dissenters, like Dr. Southey, have "moved with the sun," and the clergy have stood perversely still, and are left in darkness.'

'Another cause of the progress of Dissent, in many large towns,' says the Reviewer, 'is the poverty of the benefices.' Hence, he contends, these churches are 'by no means courted by men of splendid abilities and high character.' Here, again, is something very much like a concession in favour of the superior abilities and character of Dissenting preachers in large towns as compared with the clergy. This is an important fact. But the poverty of the benefices has little to do with the matter. The Reviewer declaims against what, he says, 'we dare to call the *vulgar prejudice* against the opulence of the clergy.' We believe that no such vulgar prejudice exists. It is against the opulence of the hierarchy, not of the clergy,—of the drones, not the working bees, that there exists, not a prejudice, but a well-founded sentiment of indignant dissatisfaction. No one will say that the curates of the Establishment are adequately or even fairly and honestly remunerated by the benefice-holders. We are quite sure that we speak the feeling of Dissenters in general when we say, that it is not the wealth of the Church of England, but the unequal and unprofitable distribution of that wealth, which is regarded as the crying grievance,—together with the evils connected with the present mode of levying it. We cannot indeed say as much with regard to the infamous opulence of the Church of Ireland. Will it be urged, that were the benefices richer, the curates might be better paid? The fact is, that the richer the benefice, very often, the poorer the curate. The poor

benefices not unfrequently fall to the share of the ablest and most laborious men in the church. We are persuaded that Dissent is not indebted in the slightest degree for its progress to the poverty of benefices. Whether, or not, it has thrived the more in consequence of non-resident incumbents and pauper curates, is another matter.

Another cause assigned by the Reviewer is, 'the superior liberality of opinion professed both in word and practice by the clergy of the establishment.' Conscious that this bold position would 'excite surprise,' even in the readers of the Quarterly Review,—a feeling which it could not possibly awake were it other than a *paradox*,—the writer is more than ordinarily ingenious in the attempt to *demonstrate* it. Serious argument, however, would be thrown away in the attempt to expose the flimsiness of this part of the Reviewer's plea for the clergy. Indeed, we are not sure whether he is quite in earnest. His panegyric savours strongly of raillery. His whole plea reads like covert satire. The temper he ascribes to the clergy could not be a cause of the progress of Dissent. He tells us himself, that it is adapted to remove the prejudices of Dissenters against the Establishment. Is it not evident, then, that the real meaning he intends to convey by what he facetiously terms a paradox, is, that the *absence* of this liberality on the part of the clergy, has been one cause of the progress of Dissent? He may be right.

The next cause which is represented as acting in diminution of the influence of the clergy, is political Jacobinism. But this we may dismiss, as the Reviewer does not venture to rank it among the causes of the progress of Dissent. He is aware that the most effectual counteraction of the spread of Jacobinical tenets, has been supplied, almost exclusively, by the exertions of Dissenters. He bears testimony to the successful and praiseworthy labours of the Methodists. But then, fearful that he has conceded too much, he goes on to speak of the 'great evils' and 'grievous sins' chargeable nevertheless on these same Methodists. The great evil is, that the rich and poor do not meet so often as they did in the same parish church, where 'the real feeling of Christian equality' was so powerfully excited by the cushioned pews of the rich and the benches of the poor. The grievous sin is, that the 'low preachers' urge perpetually those passages of Scripture which denounce woe and danger against the rich, 'to gratify the spleen, rather than to comfort the hearts of the poor,'—'to justify their hatred of the opulent.' 'The poor,' he says, 'are taught to read the fate of Dives, not merely without commiseration, but with sensations of fierce and bitter triumph.' We will not trust ourselves to charact-

erize this statement, lest our expressions should seem to partake of the fierceness and bitterness which he ascribes to the poor Methodist. We leave it to the indignation of our readers.

We find that we have not room to notice the remaining causes adduced by the Reviewer, *viz.* 'the sort of reflected interest which the Dissenters derive from the sufferings of their forefathers;' 'the great advantage which the Dissenters possess in the strict adaptation of their buildings to the purpose of preaching;' and the system adopted by some of the evangelical clergy. These points are all ably touched upon by the Nonconformist, together with a few collateral subjects to which we may perhaps advert on a future occasion. He has hunted the Reviewer through all the mazes of his inconsistencies, and has torn off the mask of philosophical candour with which he attempts to conceal the unsightliness of his bigotry. In point of ability, the Quarterly Reviewer must feel that he is in the gripe of at least an equal; and it is not for the aggressor to complain of rough handling.

-
- Art. VIII. 1. *A Pocket Expositor*; containing Reflections on every Chapter in the New Testament: selected from Doddridge's Family Expositor. 18mo. pp. 250. Price 3s. 6d. London. 1824.
2. *Selections from the Works of Archbishop Leighton*; to which is prefixed a brief Sketch of his Life. By the Rev. W. Wilson, D.D. Vicar of Church Oakley, Hants. 18mo. pp. 204. Price 3s. 6d. London. 1824.

THE practical reflections contained in Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor have generally been considered as not the least valuable part of the work. They are eminently judicious, and always breathe an admirable spirit. Some degree of sameness was, however, unavoidable, which, together with an occasional feebleness in the style, renders them susceptible of being abridged with advantage.

The Selection has evidently been made with much care, and the volume, we have no doubt, will be very generally acceptable.

We are still better pleased with the Selections from Leighton. 'The originals,' the Editor justly remarks, 'are too important and instructive to be displaced by any abridgement;' but this neat volume contains an 'essential extract' of the original in a portable form, and will be found a delightful little closet manual.

These two volumes form part of a series, which, if continued with the same judicious selection and care in the editing as are displayed in these specimens, will deserve well of the religious public.

ART. X. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

The Rev. Dr. Nares, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, is preparing for publication, *Memoirs of the Life and Administration of the Right Hon. William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, Lord High Treasurer of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth*; with extracts from his private and official correspondence and other papers not previously investigated. The work is intended to form two volumes in 4to., and to be accompanied by portraits and other engravings by the first artists.

Reflections on the Word of God for every Day in the Year, by William Ward, Missionary at Serampore, is reprinting from the Serampore edition, and will be speedily published in one thick volume, 12mo.

In the press, *Lectures on Popery*, delivered in King-street Chapel, Maidstone. By William Groser.

Mr. Phillips, Author of *Pomarium Britannicum*, and other works, has just committed to the press a new volume, on which he has long been engaged, entitled *Floral Emblems*, containing, together with a complete account of the most beautiful picturesque devices employed in ancient and modern times by the most celebrated painters and poets, a Grammar of the Language, whereby in the most pleasing manner, ideas may be communicated, or events recorded, under semblances the most fanciful that can be applied to the purposes of amusement or of decoration. The poetical passages in which a specific character is given to the different Flowers, are selected from the best writers of all ages, and the plates, which present a variety of new and delicate associations, have been designed and executed by the Author.

ART. XI. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

EDUCATION.

Sophoclis Tragediæ. Nova editio accurata in usum Prælectionem Academicarum et Scholarum, 2 tom. uniform with the Regent's Classics. 10s.

Thucydidis de Bello Peloponnesiaco, libri octo. Ad optimorum librorum fidem accurate editi. 2 tom. uniform with Sophocles. 12s.

Pindari Carmina. Ad optimorum librorum fidem accurate edita, uniform with the above. 6s.

An Introductory Key to the Greek Language: consisting of an Elementary Greek Grammar, including a "copia verborum," and some new rules for the formation of Tenses, with numerous examples; an interlineary translation of the Gospel of St. Luke: preceded by the original Text in a separate form, with a Key to Parsing. For the use of Schools and Private Students. 8vo. 9s.

Greek Delectus, for the use of Schools, consisting of Extracts from Xenophon, with an interlineary Translation, on a new plan. 8vo. 2s. A few copies to which the Grammar is added, 3s.

Hunt's Bredow's Tables of the History of the World; particularly adapted for Schools, Libraries, Reading Rooms, Coffee Rooms, &c. On three large sheets.—1. Ancient History.—2. Middle Ages.—3. Modern History. 3s. or folded in covers, 3s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The "Progress of Dissent;" containing observations on the remarkable and amusing passages of that article in the Sixty-first Number of the Quarterly Review: addressed to the Editor. By a Nonconformist. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Persecuted Family: a Narrative of the Sufferings endured by the Presbyterians in Scotland, during the Reign of Charles II. By the Author of "Helen of the Glen". 18mo. 2s.

Ralph Gemmel. A Tale. By the Author of "Helen of the Glen". 2s.

Fragments of Wisdom: a Cabinet of Select Anecdotes, Religious, Moral, and Entertaining, many of them Original, and not to be found in any former publication. With a beautiful and striking likeness of the Rev. Rowland Hill, Minister of Surry Chapel, Blackfriars, London. 18mo. 4s. 6d.

The Duty and Advantage of Early Rising, as it is favourable to Health, Business, and Devotion: including valuable Extracts from the writings of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.; Rev. Philip Doddridge, D.D.; Rev. W. Paley, D.D.; Right Rev. George Horne, D.D. Lord Bishop of Norwich; Dr. Gregory; Miss Taylor, and others. 18mo. 2s.

Pacaltsdorp; or an Account of the remarkable Progress of Civilization and Religion in a Hottentot Village, origi-

nally called Hooge Kraal, in a Letter from the Rev. John Campbell. 9d. or 7s. 6d. per dozen.

THEOLOGY.

Calvinistic Predestination repugnant to the general Tenor of Scripture: shewn in a series of Discourses on the moral attributes and government of God. By the very Rev. Richard Graves, D.D. King's Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, Dean of Ardlagh, &c.

Scientia Biblica: containing the New Testament in the Original Tongue, with the Authorized English Version, and a

Copious and Original Collection of Parallel Passages, printed in words at length. The whole so arranged as to illustrate and confirm the several clauses of each Verse; with the various Readings and the Chronology. 3 vols. 8vo. 3l.; large paper, 5l.

Practical Sermons. By the late Rev. Joseph Milner, M.A. Vicar of the Holy Trinity Church, Hull. Vol. III. 8vo. 12s.

Sermons, chiefly designed for the use of Families. By John Fawcett, M.A. Rector of Scaleby. Vol. III. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Eclectic Review.

SIR,

IN the article of the "Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. William Ward, late Baptist Missionary in India," reviewed in the Number for February, there are some mis-statements which your present correspondent is able, on very good authority, to correct.

It is stated that Mr. Ward, after he came to Hull, "joined the Baptist Church, then under the pastoral care of a Mr. Beatson."

At the time when Mr. Ward came to Hull, Mr. Beatson had relinquished the pastoral office, if he had not already "entered into his rest." However, of the Church of which he had been the pastor, Mr. Ward never was a member. A Baptist Church had been recently formed, which assembled, and which still assembles, in George-street, Hull. Of this Church, and not of the Old Baptist Church meeting in Salthouse-lane, Mr. Ward became a member.

It is further stated, that on the subject of his becoming a *Missionary*, "Mr. Ward never expressed his feelings till after his removal to Ewood-hall." On *that* subject, which evidently lay near his heart, Mr. Ward expressed his feelings and his desires *very strongly*, at an earlier period, to your present correspondent, who, to the utmost of his power, encouraged him in his views; who was his pastor, and his only pastor at Hull; who baptized him there on the 28th day of August, 1796, and afterwards received him into the Church, to the great satisfaction and joy of all the members, as well as of their pastor,

WILLIAM PENDERED.

Wellingtonborough, Feb. 14, 1825.

Since we received the above letter, Mr. Stennett also has written to us, acknowledging the inaccuracy of the statement which we copied from his Memoirs, and requesting us to insert a similar correction.

. The conclusion of the article on Epidemic Fever is unavoidably deferred, owing to the pressure of the writer's professional engagements. We hope to be able to insert it in our next Number.